



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



1793.2

193.2



W. Hurd Sc.

1474
BOSTON.

A.R. 235

THE

GENERAL REPOSITORY

AND

REVIEW.

TO BE CONTINUED QUARTERLY.

Edited by Andrews Norton

Vol. I.



C CAMBRIDGE (Mass.)

PUBLISHED BY WILLIAM HILLIARD.

Subscriptions received by W. Wells, Boston; Cushing & Appleton, Salem; Thomas & Whipple, Newburyport, Charles Tappan, Portsmouth; Daniel Adams, Portland; Charles Norris, Exeter; J. Hinds, Hanover; Swift & Chipman, Middlebury, Vt; O. D. Cooke, Hartford; Beers & Howe, New Haven; E. Sargent, New York; A. S. Seward, Utica, N. Y. Thomas Dobson, Philadelphia; P. H. Nicklin, Baltimore; E. F. Backus, Albany; Morford, Willington, & Co. Charleston, S. C. Rousmaniere & Barber, Newport; Henry Cushing, Providence; and A. Sherman, jun. New Bedford.

Hilliard & Metcalf, printers.

.....

1812.

P193.2

CONTENTS OF VOLUME FIRST.

Theological Department.

	Page.
Defence of liberal Christianity	1.
An account of the Controversy between Dr. Priestley, Dr. Horsley, and others	26, 229
Life of Semler	59, 277
An important question examined, (relating to the doctrine of the Trinity)	73
On the accuracy and fidelity of Griesbach	89
Translation of the article <i>TRINITY</i> , from Schleusner's Lexicon of the New Testament	296

Literary Department.

Critique on Moore's <i>Anacreon</i>	102
Extracts from <i>Madame de Staël's</i> memoirs	114
<i>Analecta</i>	120
Poetry	129, 241
Account of books in the Library of Harvard College	327

Review.

1. Sermons on various subjects by Henry Kollock, D. D.	125
2. A statement of proceedings in the first church in Coventry, Conn. which terminated in the removal of the pastor, &c. By Rev. Abiel Abbot, A. M. late pastor of the first church in Coventry	145
3. Two lectures on comets, read in the chapel of Harvard college, 1759, by Professor Winthrop.	
An essay on comets, by Andrew Oliver jun. Esq.	160
4. <i>Self-Control.</i> A novel	191
5. <i>Bible News of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.</i> By Noah Worcester, A. M.	
Our Saviour's divinity in primitive purity. A sermon. By Thomas Worcester, A. M.	
An impartial review of testimonies in favor of the divinity of Christ by Christians of the three first centu-	

ries, and by the council of Nice. By Noah Worcester, A. M.	
An appeal to the testimony of Christ as to what dishonors him. A sermon. By Thomas Worcester, A. M.	
Call for scripture evidence that Christ is the self-existent eternal God. A letter to Rev. Samuel Spring, D.D. By Thomas Worcester, A. M.	
The record which God has given of his Son. By Thomas Worcester, A. M.	345
6. History of the first church in Boston, together with two sermons. By Rev. William Emerson, A. M. A. S. S. S. H. S.	368
7. An Account of expeditions to the sources of the Mississippi; and through the western parts of Louisiana, &c. &c. performed by order of the government of the United States, &c. And a tour through the interior parts of New Spain. By Major Z. M. Pike. With maps and charts	374
8. Constance de Castile. A poem. By William Sotheby	410
9. An introduction to the geography and chronology of the New Testament, &c. &c. By Lant Carpenter, LL. D.	424
10. The Curse of Kehama. A poem.	
Metrical tales and other poems. By Robert Southey	448
Intelligence	203, 455
List of new publications	224, 464

THE
GENERAL REPOSITORY

FOR JANUARY, 1812.

Theological Department.

NEC TEMERE, NEC TIMIDE.

Editor

A DEFENCE OF LIBERAL CHRISTIANITY.

AMONG protestant Christians, there are two principal parties, which have been denominated with no great propriety of language the orthodox and the liberal. Between such however, as may be decisively ranked in either party, the whole interval is filled by men, whose different opinions, some more resembling those of the one side and some those of the other, may supply every shade in the gradation. But though the limits of neither division can be accurately defined, and though in each are comprehended men, who differ much in belief and sentiments from one another; yet there are some general characteristics of each division, which are sufficiently distinguishable. Those are to be considered as liberal Christians, who believe that Christianity, in respect to its main design, is a revelation from God; a revelation of religious truths beyond all comparison more important and interesting, than what unenlightened reason can with any approach to certainty discover; a revelation of the being and moral government of God, of the immortality of man, of the purpose of the present life, of the character here to be formed, and of the happiness and misery of a future state as depending on our present conduct. There are many indeed to be considered as liberal Christians, who, believing that Christianity is in its main design a revelation, do yet believe, that there are other important purposes of this dispensation. The orthodox on the contrary do not consider

Christianity in respect to its principal purpose as a revelation of any kind, but as a scheme, by which mankind, created with natures so corrupt as never to perform the will of God, and therefore justly exposed to his wrath, and the severest punishments, and utterly impotent to do any thing to deliver themselves from this condition, are now, through the sufferings and death of Christ, put into such a state, that the mercy of God is offered to all and extended to some individuals. They believe that these views of human nature and of Christianity were taught by Christ and his apostles together with other doctrines, some of them mysterious and incomprehensible, which are not to be examined by the principles of natural reason, but in the reception of which our reason is to humble itself before our faith; and they for the most part consider the reception of these doctrines as essential, some of them as the only sure foundation of the Christian character, and others as connected with duties necessary to be performed. The modes of interpretation, which these two classes of Christians apply to the scriptures, likewise form characteristic differences. The orthodox believing the writings of the evangelists and apostles to have been composed under God's immediate and miraculous superintendence, and this for the purpose of their being used and easily understood by all Christians in all countries and in all ages, of course apply to writings of so peculiar a character a mode of interpretation very different from what is applied to any other. They believe that no allowance is to be made for the inadvertence of the writer, and none for the exaggeration produced by strong feelings. They pay but little attention to that use of language, which is common in all human compositions, according to which the insulated meaning of words is not to be considered, and their true signification is that which is limited by their connexion, by some other known circumstances, or by the reason of the thing. They do not expect to find the meaning much disguised by peculiarities of expression of the writer or of the age or country to which he belonged; they pay but little regard to the circumstances in which he wrote, or to those of the persons, whom he addressed; and they are not ready to believe that writings, expressly intended for the general use of all

Christians, should be much occupied by controversies, which prevailed only in the first ages of the Church. The liberal on the contrary believe that attention should be paid to all these circumstances, and while they regard the Christian scriptures (not now to speak of the historical part) as the writings of men instructed by Christ himself, or by immediate revelation in the nature and design of Christianity, they yet consider that the same modes of criticism and explanation are to be applied to these scriptures, as to all other ancient writings.

The two classes of Christians, of which we speak, regard each other with different feelings, partly from the very nature of their opposite opinions, and partly perhaps from the temper and disposition, or from the habits of thinking and investigation, which may in the one and in the other lead to the adoption of these opinions. A liberal Christian is disposed to acknowledge, and this with no faint commendation, the piety, the religious earnestness, and the services to God and man of some of his opponents, of such men as Wilberforce and Foster. However erroneous he may think their religious opinions, he has no disposition to call in question their motives or their sincerity. But he will hardly expect in return, that even such men should be able very fairly to estimate, or ready very warmly to praise the at least equal virtues of some of those, who think very differently from them.

Various charges have of course been brought against liberal Christians, some of which it is our intention to examine. The first we shall notice is, that if our opinions be true, Christianity is something of small value; that it reveals nothing, but what might be discovered and what had been discovered by unassisted reason; that the heathen philosophers had correct notions of God and a belief of a future state; and that it is not supposable, that God should make a revelation merely for the purpose of teaching, what he had enabled us by our natural faculties to discover. To this objection it may be replied, that there is a very great difference, between believing certain truths to be the most important principles of action, something, which ought to influence and regulate the whole of life, and this upon evidence, which leaves no painful uncertainty; and considering

the same truths merely as speculative opinions, for which it would be a very pleasant thing to find evidence, and in favour of which we may think, there is an over balance of probabilities. This was the state of some of the ancient philosophers in respect to the doctrine of man's immortality. With regard to the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments, it is from its nature one, which is in a great measure merely a matter of revelation; for reason left to itself will hardly pretend to discover the precise manner, in which God will hereafter dispose of his creatures, or the degree of happiness or misery, which may await them. Of this doctrine therefore we find few vestiges in the writings of the ancient philosophers and moralists; and indeed the notion of a future state of suffering was in general treated by them with contempt. With respect to the unity and character of God we believe that not many passages, if any at all, are to be found in what they have left us of their opinions, which when properly understood may be brought to prove, that they had a correct idea of one supreme and infinite Being. But these are points, which in relation to our present purpose are scarcely worth contesting. If it could be maintained, that the ancient philosophers held all these doctrines in the same sense, in which they are taught by Christianity, still the value of this religion would not, in our view of it, be sensibly diminished. Before this can be done that must be proved, which we trust will not even be contended for, that the doctrine of a future state of happiness and misery had some considerable influence; we do not say upon the generality of men before the introduction of Christianity, but upon the generality of men in the most enlightened heathen nations; it must be proved at least, that this principle was a motive and a restraint, regulating their course of life in a considerable proportion of men; it must be proved, not that there were a few solitary individuals, who had correct notions of God, which they did not dare publicly to communicate, (we are not now ready to believe that there were such individuals) not that correct notions of God any where generally prevailed (we do not name the proof of any thing so absurd as this); but at least that there was some considerable hope, some reasona-

ble expectation, that such notions would generally prevail without the assistance of revelation. When these things are proved and when we are further convinced, that the effects of Christianity, considered as a revelation, have been much less, than what we now estimate them, and that there is no such immense difference, as we believe, between those nations, where it now prevails with some approach to its proper influence, and the most civilized nations of antiquity; or that this difference is to be attributed principally to some other cause, than the reception of those doctrines, the teaching of which we regard as its essential purpose; when we consider all this as established, we shall then begin to doubt, not of the truth, but of the inestimable value we now assign to Christianity.

The end of all religion is to make men better. Now there is no motive, which can be compared in its influence upon the moral conduct of men, with the belief of a future state of rewards and punishments. Where this exists it gives strength and efficacy to every other proper principle, and where it is wanting, no great effects are to be expected from any other motive of a moral or religious nature. It is a motive, which is alike applicable to the minds of all men; but it can only be brought to act upon the minds of men, when it rests for support upon express revelation. If therefore the disclosure of this future state had been its single purpose, still we do not think, that Christianity would have been at all unworthy of all that ceremony of preparation in the Jewish economy and the prophecies of the Old Testament, by which it was preceded, and of all that splendour of miracles, by which its descent on earth was accompanied. We do not think, that even this single purpose would have been unworthy of his mission, one of whose last and most solemn declarations concerning himself was, "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth."

We proceed to notice another charge against liberal Christians similar to the one we have been considering. It has been said, that there is no difference between them and a sober and rational infidel, who believes the being, the providence, and moral government of God and a future state; such an one for

instance as lord Herbert of Cherberry. To this it may be replied, in the first place, that such instances are very rare; and that the reception of what we regard as the doctrines of revelation is something very unfrequently to be met with, disconnected from the reception of revelation itself. Lord Herbert was indeed an extraordinary man, a man forced off and driven away from Christianity by what we consider as the corruptions, by which in his time it was surrounded. If however there be any man, who has honestly sought after the truth without finding it, and who, relying upon natural religion alone, has devoted himself to the love and service of God, and trusts in his mercy, and looks forward to immortality; if there be any such man, we are not so solicitous, as some may think we ought to be, to point out distinctions between him and ourselves for the purpose of shewing, that he has less reason than we have to hope for the mercy of our common Father. But we do not mean to dismiss the objection with this answer. That there is no difference between a liberal Christian and an unbeliever is one of those loose and undefined propositions, whose want of truth may not be perceived by him, who urges it on account of its indistinctness of meaning. If it be meant that there is no difference in respect to moral goodness, and that the rejection of the peculiar doctrines of our opponents is as culpable as the rejection of Christianity; we may assent to this, when we are convinced, first, that these doctrines are true; next, that their evidence is as clear and satisfactory as that of revelation itself; and lastly, that they are in the highest degree important, so as to make the obligation as strong upon all those, who doubt, to examine their evidence, as to examine that of revelation. If it be meant, that an unbeliever may receive what we consider the great principles of religion with such an assent as to produce in him as strong dispositions to perform his duty to God and man as in any liberal Christian; we answer, that in the present state of light and knowledge we do not think it a probable case; but if it be a supposable one, it is likewise supposable, that such an unbeliever should in this respect be on an equality with an orthodox Christian; and that for ourselves, to take the example, which may be brought against us, we do

not think, that lord Herbert was inferiour in Christian charity to Calvin, or in truth and honesty to Beza, or in real piety and holiness to either. If it be meant, and this seems to be the only meaning, which remains, that there are no essential differences of belief between a rational unbeliever and a liberal Christian; we answer, that there is at first sight a difference, which in the age of the apostles was considered essential, that the one *confesses with his mouth the Lord Jesus, and believes in his heart, that God raised him from the dead*; and that the other makes no such confession and has no such belief; we answer, that there is a most important difference between him, who believes that Christianity is a revelation from heaven, together with all the consequences of this belief, and him, who considers it as a system of fraud and folly, and admits all the consequences of this opinion; between him, who believes Jesus Christ to have been a messenger from God, and to have given by far the highest example of moral excellence ever exhibited to mankind, and him, who has at best no definite notions in respect to his character, and who can with reason and consistency regard him as nothing better, than an impostor or enthusiast; between him, who believes that God has never ceased to manifest his care for men, that by various dispensations adapted to the different ages of the world, by miracles and prophecies he has been preserving the knowledge of himself and preparing them for his last dispensation of Christianity, by which he has done so much to advance mankind in virtue and happiness, and him, who believes that God has cast the world from his hand and left us to ourselves, to the guidance of that reason, which is so easily deceived, so various and opposite in its decisions, so weak to enforce its dictates, and which, without the assistance of revelation, is so full of hesitation and uncertainty upon our most important concerns.

But we are accused, to proceed to another charge, of being remiss and indifferent in our regard to religion. If it be so, it is not the fault of our principles. With him, to whom our religion affords no motives to holiness, and no objects to interest and elevate his affections, all motives and all objects must be in vain. There can be none more interesting, there can be

none higher and more awful. May God forgive us, that we are so remiss and so indifferent. But as it is not the fault of our principles, it becomes a mere personal charge; and in the sense in which man has a right to bring it against us, comparing us with our fellow men, we hope its justice is not to be allowed. We are however not very solicitous to make our vindication, nor very unwilling to leave our own character and that of our friends to take care of itself; but as we have noticed the charge, we will proceed to make some observations on the subject, which we think in themselves deserve attention. There is a display of regard to religion sometimes, we think it must be confessed, ostentatious and sometimes offensive, which we believe is much more rarely to be found in liberal Christians, than in others. But he must have no great acquaintance with human nature, who does not know, that the affectation of any virtue is one of the worst proofs of its existence, and is very commonly a sign of its being wanted. It is not common for a man of humanity and benevolence to talk much of his humane and benevolent feelings, nor for a man of courage to assume the air of a braggart, nor for a man of honesty and truth to make many professions of his honesty and assertions of his veracity. The case in respect to religion is indeed somewhat different from what it is in respect to the social virtues; as it is not so strongly as these supported by the opinion of the world. It becomes therefore the duty of men of virtue and influence, a duty very different from that ostentatious display, of which we have been speaking, openly to profess their respect for it, and on various occasions of life in a particular manner to manifest this respect. In the performance of this duty we do not know that liberal Christians can be charged with being less faithful, than others.

But we do not, it has been said, make religion a common subject of conversation. By this we understand not to be meant, that we refrain from conversing about its evidences, its doctrines, or the subjects of critical inquiry connected with it in society, where such subjects may properly be introduced; but that we do not discourse about our religious feelings and affections and concerning the truths of religion with partic-

ular application to ourselves or those, with whom we are conversing. To this we answer, that there are subjects not to be talked of except in a very serious state of mind and with an immediate sense of their importance, and that we do not think the hours of innocent gaiety and relaxation the most proper time for the introduction of such subjects; and that there would be much danger of their losing their solemnity and their awfulness, if too frequently or familiarly introduced. We answer, that it is in a high degree offensive to a man of correct mind to make his deepest feelings and his strongest affections a subject of common discourse, to borrow the fire of the altar for the common uses of life. He, who commanded us to enter into our closets to pray, did not intend, that we should come forth to announce, with what dispositions we may have performed the duty. For that man therefore we should feel our highest respect, whose conversation should be habitually regulated by religion and morality; who should imply his sense of their obligations much oftener, than he directly expressed it; who should be always ready to converse on those subjects, which require the most serious state of mind, when his advice, his warnings, his encouragement, or his consolation might be of any value; but who for the most part in the common intercourse of life should "silent let his morals tell his mind."

Before it is attempted to confound liberal Christians with unbelievers, and before they are accused of indifference to Christianity, it may be worth while to inquire, who have been its most able and satisfactory advocates. There are none, who in this respect are to be placed in the same rank with Grotius, Butler, Lardner, Paley, and Priestley. With regard to Bishop Butler, a man hardly to be named without some expression of praise and reverence, we do not mean to quote his authority in support of our belief, nor do we feel the less respect for his character because we do not assent to all his opinions. If his name should be denied us however, it cannot be claimed by our opponents. We believe that his works are read and their high value felt by none more than by liberal Christians; and this could not be, if his views of religion in what is most essential and important were different from theirs. With regard

to the others, whom we have mentioned, we suppose there will be little dispute respecting the denomination, in which they are to be reckoned, and as little, to those who know their characters, respecting the earnestness and sincerity, with which they devoted their talents and their learning to the cause of Christianity.

We have no doubt, that what we consider the corruptions of Christianity are the cause of unbelief in some, and of indifference and inattention to religion in many. There are those, who partially feeling the force of the evidences of Christianity, are unable to reconcile themselves to what have been taught them as its doctrines, and having never properly examined any other views of it, do in a great measure dismiss the subject from their minds. Our opponents will call this the dislike of corrupt human nature to the truth, we shall call it the repulsion of our reason and our natural feelings, to their doctrines. These men, whom their doctrines have thus alienated from Christianity, we wish to reconcile to our religion, and make rational and consistent Christians; but for their indifference or their infidelity, we are not to be made accountable.

Another charge against liberal Christians is, that they reduce religion to a mere system of morals, that they teach and regard as essential nothing more, than a worldly and pagan morality. If it be true, that we teach morality, and regard it as essential, it is praise, which we shall not willingly relinquish. It is true, that we have no respect for that religion, which, where the means of doing good exist, does not manifest itself in a life of usefulness; which does not prompt to continual exertion, not to any violent and irregular startings off from our proper sphere, for the purpose of some extraordinary course of action, which the world may wonder at, but to a patient, regular, faithful, unostentatious discharge of daily and it may be humble duties. The religion, which we respect, does not produce any temporary, unnatural excitement of feelings, which may or may not have a very little to do with personal holiness; but it forms habits of virtue and self-control, it restrains the passions, it regulates the temper, and it produces throughout the whole character a gradual but constant progression in ex-

cellence. It has no sectarian air, no habitual look of gloom and repulsion, no assuming of censorship and superiority; but it mingles in the world, and sheds a beneficial and improving influence upon all around, and regulates in its possessor, either directly or as a more remote principle, all his actions toward his fellow-creatures. These are our views of the effects of religion, as far as they are apparent. If any one doubts their correctness, we shall not now attempt to disturb him in his opinions.

It is true also, that we regard with thorough dislike the manner in which a virtuous and religious life, or to use language, that however proper in itself may recal the barbarous jargon of technical theology, in which *good works* are spoken of in the creeds of Calvinism and in the writings of men of this belief. We think, that the sentiments to which we refer in these creeds and writings are not less hostile to morality, than the doctrines with which they are connected are injurious to religion. There is nothing to which our irregular passions will not sooner submit, than to the uniform observance of those rules of piety and virtue, which never intermit their authority, and never relax their obligation, but there is no difficulty in forming an alliance between religion and the passions, if the former can be understood as not directly connected with this observance. One cause of the prevalence of almost all the corruptions of Christianity is the desire to substitute something else in the stead of personal holiness; to make something different from this the foundation of our hope of God's mercy. To this cause we may attribute the penances, the pilgrimages, the ceremonies, and the indulgences of the Romish church, which have all been made substitutes for a good life; and to the same indisposition to consider this as essential, and to acknowledge the necessity of continual regard to our own conduct, we may attribute, in a considerable degree, the doctrines of imputed sin and imputed righteousness, of a nature thoroughly corrupt, during whose existence we can perform no good action, and of its miraculous renovation, after which we cannot finally fall away, and above all the manner of speaking before referred to, respecting a virtuous life. Let us not however be misun-

derstood. We do not confound the general cause of the prevalence of certain sentiments with the particular cause of their reception by many individuals, nor the natural tendency of these sentiments with their actual operation in many instances. We have no doubt that there are many Catholics and many Calvinists, who would insist as strongly as we should on the necessity of habitual virtue.

These views of religion and of the doctrines of Calvinism are what probably have given occasion to the charge we are noticing, which is made, we suppose, with very little attention to its force or meaning. If there be any one, who seriously thinks it true; who thinks, that we regard no other duties, than those of man to man, and rely on no other motives to virtue, than what the present life affords; that we believe in God with somewhat more delightful views, we suppose it will be confessed, of his nature and moral government, than what many other Christians entertain, and yet regard him with no love, nor reverence, nor fear, and do not make this belief the foundation of all virtue and of all hope; that we believe Jesus Christ to have been the messenger of God, and yet view his perfect character with no admiration, and his labours and sufferings with no gratitude; that we believe a future life of happiness and misery, and yet regard its most awful sanctions with indifference; if there be any one, who thinks all this true, we suppose no attempt could be much more hopeless, than the attempt to undeceive him.

But it is said, to notice another charge, that we deprive religion of all its doctrines, which may give joy or consolation, that our principles afford no hope in life and no comfort in death. Some doctrines we reject, which we should think not very fruitful of joy and consolation, and which we believe have driven many persons sincerely good to gloom and despondency, and some to melancholy and madness, and one or another of these consequences we should think they would naturally produce, we do not say in a common mind, but in a mind of sensibility, of proper affections, and in the habit of thinking seriously on religious subjects. If it be thought however, that our views of the present condition of man are little adapted to promote happiness or virtue, we can compare them with those,

to which they are opposed. We believe that man is a being possessed of powers, which he may abuse, and which it is morally impossible that he should not in some instances abuse, before he has formed habits of exercising them aright; and of passions, whose natural tendency to excess is to be restrained by experiencing the ill effects of this excess in himself, or witnessing them in others. We believe, that his highest happiness consists in the right exercise of these powers, and the proper indulgence of some of these passions. Of this highest happiness therefore, he is of course incapable, till he has formed habits of virtue, that is of properly exercising his powers, and habits of self-control, that is of properly restraining his passions. For the formation of these habits we believe the present life to be a state of discipline admirably adapted. If these habits be here formed, we believe that he will be removed to a better state of existence, adapted to his improved nature, where we think it is the doctrine of reason and of revelation, that his faculties will be continually enlarging and new objects continually presented to his intellect and his affections. If, on the contrary, habits of vice and irregularity be formed, he cannot be happy. The whole order of nature must first be reversed. As to his future state we leave it in the same terrible uncertainty, in which it is left by revelation. Now to this view, which represents all men as made capable of obtaining, through the mercy and love of their common Father, eternal blessedness, and made capable of continual progression in happiness and virtue, what is opposed so much more joyful and consolatory? A scheme, that we have before noticed, which represents all mankind since our first parents as created by God with natures so corrupt as to be able to do nothing to secure themselves from eternal misery. We use the mildest language possible; that of the creeds and confessions is, that mankind are under "God's displeasure and curse; "so as we are by nature children of wrath, bondslaves to "satan, and justly liable to all punishments in this world "and that which is to come. And the punishments in the "world to come are everlasting separation from the comfortable presence of God and most grievous torments in

"soul and body without intermission in hell-fire forever."* From this terrible condition a part of mankind are saved, through the atonement of Christ. They are chosen from among the rest, not because they are better, than those who are left, nor with reference to any works or endeavours of their own, but out of God's mere good pleasure. We give the doctrine of the creeds: some may choose to affirm that this election is not with any certain and natural reference to their own endeavours, and may shrink from the assertion of more hardy orthodoxy, that "all works done by unregenerate men are sinful."† Those, who are thus chosen, are made regenerate, that is, their natures undergo a miraculous renovation and they become fit for heaven. Those, who are left, perish everlastingly without possibility of escape. We shall make no comment upon this scheme, nor urge the comparison, that we have mentioned. We will only observe before quitting the subject, that we suppose there are some men, who receive what is most essential in it, who yet may be shocked at the horrible absurdity of language, in which the parts of it are sometimes expressed. We request such men to define their notions, and see how far they do in fact differ from the original doctrines.

But it may be said, that he, who, according to the scheme just mentioned, believes, or, as some will have it, knows himself to be one of the elect, must have a much more joyful confidence in God's peculiar love and mercy, than what any one can enjoy upon our principles. It may be so. The best of us can have no more confidence than what the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews possessed, and can only say with him, "we trust we have a good conscience." We can have no more assurance, than St. Paul enjoyed, when he told the Corinthians of his care, *lest by any means, having preached to others, he himself should become a cast-away*. We can have no other confidence, than what arises from the testimony of our consciences and a perfect trust in the impartial mercy of God; and if there be, who possess any other, we think it built on a very fallacious found-

* Assembly's Larger Catechism.

† See Westminster confession of Faith, c. 16. s. 7.

dation, and suppose, that it is for the most part somewhat wavering and uncertain.

If our religion be the guide of our life, we have no fear that she will desert us in its trials and sorrows, or that her aid will be ineffectual for our support. The companion of our prosperity will make adversity a lesson of virtue, and enable us to bear it with resignation and perhaps with cheerfulness. And in that hour, when we shall have no other support, and no other availing comforter, she will not fail us. Through her influence the visions of immortality, to which in life she has directed our eyes, will grow brighter and more distinct around our death-bed, as all other objects are receding. We have no envy for him, who can speak of her as wanting in joy, or poor in consolation. We only desire, that we may be more worthy of her joys and consolations, and feel a more profound gratitude to Him, from whom she has descended.

But whatever may be the character or the influence of our opinions, it is still further urged against us, that these opinions are supported by unnatural constructions of scripture, by rejecting the plain sense and substituting a forced meaning in its place. If by the plain sense of the scriptures be meant that, which would first occur to a person educated in the belief of certain doctrines, which liberal Christians consider no part of Christianity, and reading them in an English translation without any knowledge of the original language, or any collateral learning to assist in the right understanding of them, then as to a considerable part of the scriptures, the charge is to be admitted. Whether or not it will be a very serious one is a further question; and whether or not this should be considered the plain sense of scripture depends in a considerable degree on the decision of the question, which of the two modes of interpretation formerly mentioned is preferable. To one reading the scriptures in the manner we have mentioned, an unjustifiable construction may appear to be put upon many passages, which have long been forced into the support of theological systems, when they are only restored to their true and natural meaning. But supposing it to be granted, that the Christian scriptures are to be studied in the same manner as all other an-

cient writings, and that a variety of ancient learning is to be brought to their elucidation, a knowledge of Jewish and heathen antiquities, of the language, in which they were written, and of this language as affected by the modes of oriental and Jewish phraseology, of Jewish opinions, of the controversies, which prevailed in the time of the apostles, and of all those other circumstances, which may tend to explain the general design of the different writings and the particular meaning of single passages, granting that this is to be done; if then it be affirmed, that we reject what in this mode of study may appear the plain sense of scripture, we deny the charge. But we do more, we contend, that our opinions are supported by the plain sense and the general tenor of scripture, such as it will appear to the most illiterate, if at the same time he be an unprejudiced reader. We contend, that the doctrines of our opponents are contradicted by the general meaning of scripture, and are apparently supported only by a few detached passages. Let us take for example that doctrine, which places Jesus Christ on an equality with the God and Father of us all. By the removal of a very few passages, we might leave a volume not sensibly diminished in bulk, in no part of which would this doctrine find any support, and as to many parts of which it would appear in the highest degree inconsistent and contradictory. If we take for another example the doctrine of the total impotence of man and irresistible grace, we may go through the New Testament, and with not many strokes of the pen blotting out every passage in which it can be pretended, that this doctrine finds support, we shall leave a body of doctrines, and precepts, and promises, and exhortations, and threatenings, to which it will appear not very easily reconcileable. It is in the explanation of those difficult and perverted passages, which seem to give countenance to such doctrines, difficult because they have been so long perverted, that one of the principal uses of the critical study of the scriptures consists.

But it may be further objected to us, that if we are in the right, the church, the great majority of Christians, has been for ages in error. Be it so. For how many ages, we may ask in reply, has the church been confessedly in error? Will any pro-

testant pretend, that Christianity existed among the great majority of Christians in any degree of purity from the end of the fourth century to the reformation, a period of a thousand years. During this long period the articles of belief taught and received for its doctrines are such, as show to what debasement and prostration the human mind may be reduced, and how entirely the resistance of reason to any modes of faith may be subdued. During this period the superstitions of paganism were reinstated under other names in the temples of God. The proper influence of Christianity could not be wholly prevented, nor could its restoring power, its tendency to revive and purify itself be at any time entirely hindered from acting; but its authority was falsified to minister to public and private wickedness; the religion of humility, benevolence, and purity, was represented as being in league with ambition, cruelty, and lust, and affording them her support. During all this period the light of the moral world was *in dim eclipse, shedding disastrous twilight*. For so long a time then at least the authority of the church is not of value enough to be urged against us.

We will give a very brief account of what we consider the causes of those errors, that have been connected with Christianity, and that have at times almost hidden from view the few simple and sublime truths, which it was its purpose to reveal. To him, who considers the state of the world at the time of the introduction of Christianity, it will appear a thing to have been expected beforehand, that when it should no longer be under the immediate care of our Saviour and his apostles, it would very soon be mingled with much error and absurdity in the minds of those, by whom it was embraced. Mankind were not in a state to receive without corrupting a religion so simple and so spiritual. With regard to God, the objects of another life and a great part of the character, which Christianity requires, the mass of men, out of the Jewish nation, had neither ideas nor feelings; and even in respect to the moral virtues it inculcates, their notions were not a little confused and inadequate. But every one conversant with such subjects may be able, in some degree, to comprehend with how much difficulty an entire new class of ideas and feelings can be

introduced into the mind, especially if they relate to spiritual objects; how imperfectly these objects can be discerned till the mind has become habituated to their contemplation; how much all ideas concerning them are debased and mingled with former sentiments, and how readily the mind recurs to its prior associations, and relapses into its old habits of thought and feeling. It may be easily believed therefore, that the Gentile converts did not immediately comprehend all that our religion teaches; that they were not free from the influence of their former associations and habits, and that they were not at once transformed from ignorant heathen to enlightened Christians. If a thing so probable in itself be in need of extrinsic proof, it may be shewn to have been the case from different passages in the writings of the apostles. That the Jewish converts connected with Christianity every thing in their ancient prejudices and opinions, which could be united with it, and that if unresisted, they would have introduced into it some very gross corruptions, appears also very fully from the scriptures themselves. There were likewise in this early age other errors of no small magnitude, whose origin we cannot so clearly trace. Some for instance taught, that the resurrection was already past,* and others wrested, (we know not certainly in support of what false doctrines,) the epistles of St. Paul, as well as the Jewish scriptures.† If such dispositions to alter and to add to our religion existed in the times of the apostles, it is probable, that they would exert themselves with much more force as soon as the immediate personal authority of the apostles was removed, and men's minds were no longer subdued by the visible display of miraculous powers.

But it is not wholly nor principally to the lower class of Christians, that we are to look for the origin of those errors, which have been connected with Christianity. We are to refer the greater part of them to the learned and philosophizing converts; and corruptions from this source seem to have shewn themselves nearly as soon as from the former. The errors of the Gnostics, as well as of the Jews, are censured in the writings of the apostles themselves. Some of the heathen philosophers

* 2 Tim. ii. 18.

† 2 Peter iii. 16.

deserted their schools for the temples of Christianity, but they did not leave behind them their former opinions, and they could not leave behind them their former habits of mind. With what they now learnt they mingled much of what before they had perhaps been accustomed to teach. With their ideas of Christianity they incorporated somewhat of their former philosophy, they endeavoured to discover resemblances between its doctrines and those they had lately held, and to conform them as far as possible to each other. This, which from the very constitution of the mind, they would naturally have done, they had a further inducement to do, from the desire to recommend to others the religion, they had themselves received, by shewing its analogy to modes of faith already existing, and to systems of opinions already in respect. It was doing the same thing, though probably with a less explicit acknowledgment to themselves of the principle of their conduct, which the Roman catholic missionaries have since been accustomed to do, in attempting the conversion of pagan nations to Christianity. A principal source of the errors, which they introduced, seems to have been a desire to elevate the character of our Saviour, and to make it such as they thought would be more respected by the world. The strength of the motive of this ill-directed ambition cannot be estimated by one, who does not recollect, how much offence the circumstances of the introduction of our religion must have given to the pride of rank and learning; that its founder suffered as a malefactor; that his apostles were in general taken from the lower class of men, and were continually exposed to those sufferings, with which disgrace is usually associated, and that it had its origin in a nation, whom the rest of the world hated and despised.

The errors, of which we have spoken, the Christian fathers would less readily have fallen into, if they had been better skilled to understand the scriptures. But partaking before their conversion, and even in a considerable degree afterward, of the common feelings of the heathen world against the Jews, they were not much disposed to make what related to that people an object of particular study. The language, in which the sacred books of the Old Testament were written, if they acquired at

all, they acquired after becoming Christians. They were, for the most part, but imperfectly acquainted either with the internal or external character of the religion of the Jews. They were in a great degree ignorant of their opinions, their prejudices, their pretensions, their controversies, their habits and manners, and their modes of phraseology. But without something of all this knowledge many parts of the Christian scriptures, and especially the epistles of St. Paul, cannot, in our opinion, as we have before stated, be correctly understood. They were likewise introduced at once to all the new ideas connected with a new religion, and to all the new modes of expression, in which these were of necessity conveyed; and these ideas and expressions existed in writings, which were in a dialect different from any thing to which they had been accustomed, in its forms of construction, and in some degree in the signification of language, using Greek words with an Hebrew idiom; so that those, to whom Greek was their common language, were perhaps nearly as much perplexed as assisted in the study of the scriptures, by their knowledge of it as spoken or written by heathen nations.

Disqualified as the Christian Fathers thus were, the scriptures could hardly have fallen into the hands of worse interpreters; and many of their explanations of different passages, both those adduced by them in support of their doctrines as well as others, have accordingly been the wonder and ridicule of succeeding commentators. In the scriptures thus imperfectly understood they were never at a loss for arguments. The meaning, which was so obscurely seen, was made to assume any form, that fancy might choose to impose. They interpreted mystically and allegorically; and a passage, which in sound and words resembled a proposition in which they expressed some one of their doctrines, was not among the most contemptible arguments they brought in its support. They began contending together, and in their controversies they mutually drove each other further from the truth. The doctrines of the orthodox however, or in other words, of that party in these different controversies, which finally prevailed, were established as the true faith; and continued to be the doctrines of the church till

the time of the reformation. The reformers, when they broke off from the remaining body of Christians, left behind them many, but by no means all of these doctrines. Some of them still prevail, together with many of the explanations and much of the general mode of interpreting scripture, with which they were connected.

But why, it may be asked, and the question is an important one, why was not more resistance made earlier, than it has been, to errors, which we consider of so gross a nature, and connected with a subject of much interest? We answer, in the first place, that the question does not concern us alone. Why, we may ask any protestant in return, were what he will acknowledge to be gross errors suffered to prevail almost unresisted during the ten centuries before the reformation? But we shall not content ourselves with this reply. We answer, that it may, ^{be} and that it has been shewn by other writers, with regard to some of the most important errors which we oppose, that they had their origin among the learned and philosophizing Christian converts, and that they were not introduced without difficulty and without opposition from the great body of the unlearned, who had no prejudices in their favor; nor were they introduced at once, but gradually. But from the period of their introduction till almost our own age, there was no time, at which much further resistance could be expected. At the time when Christianity began generally to be known, literature, and moral science, and true philosophy were all on the decline. Indeed in the best days of antiquity there seems to have been but little of that manly reasoning in morals and in metaphysics, that power of treating abstract subjects, that vigor of mind, which repels from it error and absurdity, which we may discover in later times. There is nothing of an intellectual nature perhaps, in which the improvement of mankind is more apparent. We should seek in vain in any ancient writer for something resembling the reasonings of Butler, or the metaphysics of Locke. If such then were the general character of ancient times, there was no reason to expect, that men should be much shocked in receiving established errors and absurdities connected with Christianity, similar perhaps to those, which their predecessors

had received as making a part of their philosophy, especially as this was done in an age of greater ignorance and less vigor of inquiry than that, in which this philosophy first prevailed. There was nothing in the character of the times succeeding the reign of Constantine, previous to which some of the most important corruptions of Christianity were introducing, which might lead one to expect any powerful efforts of reason in opposing these or any other popular errors. Not long after his reign, the barriers of the Roman Empire began to give way, and a flood of ignorance and barbarism to pour in upon the civilized world. Then succeeded the ages, when the despotism of superstition was confirmed, and all was passive under her sway.

This power was at last shaken. The minds of men having been exercised about other objects, and recovering some degree of strength, began to react against the religious tyranny by which they were oppressed. The time of the reformation arrived. The reformers freed Christianity from many of the errors, with which it had been surrounded, they left however many unassailed, and they substituted some of their own, instead of some of those which they removed. We know, that there are men, who consider the doctrines of the reformation as the standard of true belief, but to us it seems a thing little to be expected beforehand, that these should be found the pure doctrines of Christianity. It would have been an event without any parallel, if the reformers, educated in the belief of the prevailing superstitions and false doctrines of their age, and having them incorporated with all their religious principles and feelings, had been able not merely to free themselves from some of these, but to cast them all off together; and in the struggle and laceration of their minds to examine and to discriminate all truth from all error; if educated in that age and in that religion in which they were, they had possessed the most enlightened views, and been able to refer every thing to the most correct principles; if while vehemently resisting some corruptions, and having their attention directed particularly to these, they had had leisure or disposition to turn aside and to consider all the other subjects connected with our religion, and to settle the most correct belief upon

these also; if they had been willing at once to oppose themselves to later and to earlier error; if, in setting themselves against the church as it existed in their day, they had not wished to have in their favor, or at least to render neutral, the authority of the church in earlier times, and therefore had felt no solicitude to determine whether she might not even then have departed from the simplicity of the gospel; and if they had felt none of that very common fear of carrying their inquiries too far, and departing too much from the faith they had once held; or if on the other hand, in the violence of that fierce controversy, in which they were engaged, they had been able coolly and with impartiality to estimate all the arguments for and against the opinions they defended; if they had assumed no untenable positions; if they had never been driven or been hurried over the bounds of truth; if they had never mistaken the *reverse of wrong for right*, and if they had never opposed one error to another, (the doctrine of irresistible grace, for instance, to the doctrine of merit;) or if, in fine, when men had just begun anew to study the scriptures, in the infancy of scriptural criticism, (we use the term in its most extensive sense), they had anticipated all the advantages to be derived from this most important study, and rendered useless, or worse than useless, in respect to making known the true character of Christianity, the labors of so many eminent men, who have in succeeding times devoted their lives to the elucidation of the sacred writings, and if receiving these writings, as we believe they did, incrust-ed over with a covering of false interpretations, which hid their original meaning from view, they had been able at once to discern the true character of our religion. The reformers were educated in error, they were engaged in violent controversies, and they lived in an age of comparative ignorance, and we do not think the authority of such men of much value, to establish their doctrines as the standard of belief; we do not believe that the midnight darkness of superstition was at once succeeded by the noon-day splendor of truth; our philosophy teaches us to expect such changes as little in the moral as in the natural world.

From the time of the reformation we think, that by the pre-

gress of knowledge and of freedom of inquiry, the real character of Christianity has been more and more made known among protestant nations; and we think we discern the influence of these more correct views of religion in the gradual but very perceptible improvement of these nations, during the three last centuries, in virtue and happiness, in a more established and more general sense of right and wrong, in a better regulated state of society, and in the cultivation of the humane and social affections. In comparing the present character and condition of men in these nations with what it was in the most civilized countries at the time of the introduction of Christianity, we perceive the effects of our religion, and in comparing the same present state of society with what it was two centuries ago, we perceive, as we think, the effects of a more improved knowledge of our religion. The more directly the few simple and most important truths of Christianity can be made to act on the minds of men without being impeded in their operation; the more men's attention is directed to these, without being distracted and occupied by the false doctrines with which they have been connected; the more they can be taught to value themselves upon being Christians, and not upon being Christians of a certain sect; the more difficulty they find in mistaking the bitter feelings of a party for a zeal in the cause of religion; the more those corruptions can be removed, whose tendency is to substitute something else for personal holiness; the more our religion can be freed from those additions of human weakness and folly, which have debased its character in the regard of some men, and men of powerful minds, by whom it might otherwise have been respected, and which have rendered some, unbelievers, and many, doubtful and indifferent, as to its truth; the more all this can be done, the more powerful and universal will be its influence. We rejoice in the progress of rational religion, because as we have before said, we think it the progress of human virtue and happiness. We think the advancements in philosophy and moral science, and the advancements in the knowledge of true religion, mutually promote each other.

But, while we rejoice in the gradual progress of truth, we have no intemperate zeal for making proselytes. Though

gratified like the rest of the world, that others should think with us, we can be content, that even some of those whom we personally love and respect, should think differently. There are many, especially among the aged, whose belief we might think erroneous, but whose belief we should have no disposition to disturb. With it are intertwined all their religious principles and affections, and the former could hardly be removed without the latter being shattered or destroyed. It is the lot likewise of a great part of the world to receive their religious opinions upon authority, and though there are many belonging to this class, whose opinions we might by no means esteem altogether true, yet we should not be very ready to lead them to doubt of the correctness of the authority in which they had confided, lest their distrust should extend to all they had been taught; and because we might not be able to substitute our own, instead of that authority which we had weakened or overturned. To such men we do not address ourselves, or we only address ourselves to say, that if their faith has produced the fruits of good living, if it has shewn itself in love to God and love to man, we have no question of its excellence and its sufficiency to salvation; we should be among the last of men to wish them to feel pain from any doubts of its correctness. Let it be remembered however, that we say this only to humble and unobtrusive piety, and not to intolerant ignorance, which pretends to dogmatize, and to make its own opinions the standard of belief. On questions, where wisdom, and learning, and piety must have decided wrong, because in different men they have given opposite decisions, it does not become any one, who has not spent some time and some thought in their examination, to intrude his opinions, and far less to denounce his censures. There is an obligation upon every one, which as it respects ourselves we hope we do not forget, to examine, with very serious attention, the reasonableness of that faith in himself, which he is willing should have any influence upon the faith of others.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE CONTROVERSY BETWEEN
DR. PRIESTLEY AND DR. HORSLEY, THE MONTH-
LY REVIEWER, AND OTHERS. *Editor*

IN the year 1782 Dr. Priestley published his *History of the Corruptions of Christianity*. Among these corruptions he conceived the doctrine of the Trinity to hold a principal place. The design accordingly of the First Part of this work, is to show, that this doctrine in its present form is of no higher antiquity than the Nicene Council; that it gradually assumed this form, having its origin in the attempts of some of the more learned and platonizing Christian converts to elevate the character of Christ, and to accommodate what they found in Christianity to their previous opinions; that among the principal of these was Justin Martyr; that before his time the faith of the church was strictly unitarian, and that it long continued such among the majority of the unlearned, the mass of Christians. This he argues from the writings of the Fathers themselves, in which he thinks the gradual progress of the corruption is clearly to be traced; and who, though their own opinions were at first approximating to orthodoxy, and at last became orthodox, do yet afford sufficient evidence, that these opinions were not the faith of the first ages, nor afterward of a majority, nor later still of a considerable number of Christians. He has no witnesses on his own side to produce, but he collects his evidence from cross-examining those of his opponents.

This argument for unitarianism, though not altogether novel, was probably new to most readers, and had never been stated before with so much distinctness and force. It of consequence called forth some able defenders of the established doctrine; among whom the most distinguished were Dr. Horsley and a writer in the *Monthly Review*, Mr. Badcock. In the number of the *Monthly Review* for June 1783 appeared the commencement of a criticism of Dr. Priestley's *History*, containing what relates to the First Part of that work; and in the spring of the same year Dr. Horsley opened his attack, by publishing his "Charge to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of St. Albans,"

in which he occupied himself almost wholly in endeavouring to point out errors and imperfections in the same portion of Dr. Priestley's History.* To the Monthly Reviewer Dr. Priestley replied in the month of July, and about the same time appeared an anonymous defence of his work, against the Reviewer, entitled, "Remarks, in Vindication of Dr. Priestley, on that Article of the Monthly Review, which relates to the First Part of Dr. Priestley's History of the Corruptions of Christianity." To Dr. Priestley's Reply an answer was made by a review of it, which occupies thirty three pages in the Number for September, and that of his anonymous defender was noticed the following month. In the autumn of the same year Dr. Priestley published his "Letters to Dr. Horsley in reply to his Animadversions," to which were subjoined remarks on that article in the Monthly Review for September, which was in answer to his former reply. To these letters, in allusion to Dr. Horsley's confident manner of writing, he prefixed the motto, "Let not him, that girdeth on his harness, boast himself as he that putteth it off." Of these letters there appeared a criticism in the Monthly Review for January 1784, which occupies fourteen pages. To this Dr. Priestley immediately gave a reply, entitled, "Remarks on the Monthly Review of the Letters to Dr. Horsley."† These remarks produced an answer in "A Letter to Dr. Priestley," (by the Monthly Reviewer, Mr. Badcock himself,) "occasioned by his late pamphlet addressed to the Rev. S. Badcock."‡ In the summer of 1784 Dr.

* Of this there is a short Review in the Monthly Review for November 1783; but without any original arguments or additional matter by the Reviewer.

† Of this there is a short notice in the number of the Review for May, which, it is said, is "to be considered as conveying the general sentiment of the corps of Monthly Reviewers;" and in which they declare, that, "In the opinion of the impartial public, we have already so decided a superiority in the late controversy with Dr. Priestley, that we think it would be quite superfluous to pay any particular attention to these unimportant remarks on the Review."

‡ Of this there is a notice in the number for July, in which the reviewers declare, that their advocate has managed the case, which they had dropped

Horsley published his "Letters from the Archdeacon of St. Albans in reply to Dr. Priestley." In the same year Dr. Priestley made answer to these in his "Letters to Dr. Horsley, Part II." In 1785 Dr. Horsley published his "Sermon on the Incarnation," which has some relation to this controversy, and in the spring of 1786 his "Remarks on Dr. Priestley's Second Letters." Again without delay Dr. Priestley was ready for the contest, and issued his third series of "Letters to Dr. Horsley," which are dated June first of the same year. Here the controversy between him and Dr. Horsley for some time rested. In this year Dr. Priestley published his "History of Early Opinions concerning Jesus Christ," in 4 vols. 8vo. At last Dr. Horsley renewed the controversy, and in 1789 collected the Tracts, which he had before published, annexing to them additional notes and six supplemental disquisitions. To these disquisitions Dr. Priestley replied in his "Defences of Unitarianism for the years 1788 and 1789," the first of which are Letters to Dr. Horsley. This was the last publication in the controversy between them.* The History of Early Opinions was replied to by Dr. Jamieson, in 1794, in his "Vindication of the Doctrine of Scripture and of the Primitive Faith concerning the deity of Christ," 2 vols. 8vo.

so much to their satisfaction, that they "are content to leave it wholly in his hands."

* Beside the attacks on Dr. Priestley, with respect to his historical arguments in favor of Unitarianism, before mentioned, there were many others of less importance; by Mr. Howes in his "Observations on Books; by Professor White in a note on his eighth Sermon at the Bampton Lecture; by Samuel Rowles in his "Remarks on Dr. Priestley's Letters to Dr. Horsley; by the Dean of Canterbury in "Sermons, of which I do not find the particular title; by Dr. Geddes in a "Letter to Dr. Priestley; by Rev. James Barnard, a Catholic, in a "work, with which I am acquainted only from Dr. Priestley's reply; by Dr. Knowles, Prebendary of Eli, in a tract, entitled, " "Primitive Christianity;" and by James Pye Smith in his Letters to Belsham; and probably by some others. The most of these I have not been able to procure; nor do I suppose that they contain much of importance not to be found in the works mentioned in the text, which were the principal ones in this controversy. I should however be much indebted for the loan of either of those marked with an asterisk, or for any other publications relating to the *historical argument*, to any gentleman, who may have them, and will direct to the Editor of the Repository.

Of the controversy between Dr. Priestley and the Monthly Reviewer and Dr. Horsley, it is my intention to give an account. When any thing new may be found respecting the points in dispute either in Dr. Priestley's larger work, his *History of Early Opinions*, or in the reply to it by Jamieson, or in any other works in my possession relating to the controversy, this also will be stated. The account now given, it is intended, shall be such as to preclude the necessity of studying the controversy, though not of reading the larger work of Dr. Priestley, his *History of Early Opinions*, nor the Reply of Jamieson, if this latter from the specimens, which may be given of his general learning, his knowledge of the subject, and his mode of arguing, may be thought worth that labour. Such an account, we think, will for various reasons be interesting. The controversy is in itself very important. In our country a complete collection of the publications, in which it is contained, is not easily to be procured; and, if procured, considerable labour and study is necessary to bring together the arguments on each side, and to estimate their value. In its present state likewise, it is to most readers involved in some obscurity; partly from its very nature, and partly from the style of writing and mode of arguing, adopted by one of the disputants, Dr. Horsley. I shall endeavour to make the present account such as may be intelligible to all readers, who would have an interest in the subject, and shall occasionally introduce some information and remarks, that may assist in forming a judgment on the merits of the different arguments. The victory in this controversy has been claimed by the opponents of Dr. Priestley with an air of decision and triumph, which may excite some suspicions of the justness of the claim in the minds of those accustomed to think for themselves; but which is well adapted to impose upon the ignorant, and which, without doubt, has had its effect upon many, who know very little else of the real state of the controversy. Whether or not it has been justly claimed, the present statement may afford some advantage for determining. There have been also, as is well known, very harsh charges of wilful error and of gross carelessness made against Dr. Priestley, principally with reference to his writings on the subject of this

controversy; and in what follows I shall endeavour to show how much of error and carelessness there is in these writings, and how much of exaggeration and incorrectness in these charges.

That the account of the controversy, which I am about to give, may be better understood, I shall prefix a short analysis of the first part of Dr. Priestley's "*History of the Corruptions*," which may assist the recollection of those, by whom it has been read, and in some measure supply the place of its reading to those, by whom it has not.

The first section treats "of the opinion of the ancient Jewish and Gentile churches." The first argument from history, for their holding the unitarian doctrines, is the following. The Jewish Christians were in general called Ebionites; they likewise retained the name of Nazarenes, which was given at first indiscriminately to all the followers of Christ. The identity of the Nazarenes and Ebionites may be proved. Dr. Priestley said in his first edition, that it was acknowledged by Origen and Epiphanius, which in the subsequent edition he altered so as to affirm, that it may be inferred from Origen, Epiphanius, and Eusebius. There were no other Jewish Christians, to speak generally, beside those, who were called by these names. But none of these believed the divinity of Christ, in any sense of the word. It was not therefore believed by the Jewish Christians.

The next argument is from Hegesipus, an ecclesiastical historian of the second century, a Jewish Christian, who wrote in continuation of the Acts of the apostles; but of whose works only a few inconsiderable fragments are preserved. He travelled to Rome about the year 160. In giving an account of the heresies of his time, he mentions different branches of the Gnostics, (who believed that Christ had a preexistence, and was a man only in appearance); but does not speak of the Nazarenes or Ebionites. He "says, that in his travels to Rome, "where he spent some time with Anicetus, and visited the "bishops of other sees, he found that they all held the same "doctrine that was taught in the Law, by the prophets, and by "our Lord. What could this be," asks Dr. Priestley, "but "the proper unitarian doctrine, held by the Jews, and which

"he himself had been taught?" Valesius, the translator of "Eusebius," Dr. Priestley afterward subjoins in his first edition, "was of opinion that the history of Hegesippus was neglected and lost by the ancients, because it was observed to favour the unitarian doctrine." In his second edition he altered the conclusion of this sentence, so as to say, that the history was in the opinion of Valesius lost, "on account of the errors it contained, and these errors could be no other than the unitarian doctrine."

"Almost all the ancient writers, who speak of what they call the heretics of the two first centuries, say, that they were of *two kinds*; the first were those, that thought that Christ was a man only in appearance, and the other that he was a mere man. Tertullian calls the former Docetæ, and the latter Ebionites." But that the opinion of the latter was no heresy, but the truth of the Gospel, may be inferred, according to Dr. Priestley, from St. John's censuring the former in the severest manner, while of the latter he takes no notice at all. See his 1 Ep. iv. 3. Dr. Priestley understands the introduction of his gospel as alluding "to the very same system of opinions, which he had censured in his epistle."

The next argument is from Athanasius, who, says Dr. Priestley, "was so far from denying that the primitive Jewish church was properly unitarian, that he endeavours to account for it." The quotation given from Athanasius we shall at present omit. It will be hereafter noticed in this account.

It is not to be believed, in the opinion of Dr. Priestley, that St. John would have censured with so much severity those, who held, that *Christ was not come in the flesh*, or was not truly man, and would have passed uncensured those, who denied the divinity of his Lord and Master, if he himself had thought him to be true and very God, his Maker as well as his Redeemer. Nor is it credible, if this had been the doctrine of the apostles, that the whole Jewish church, or any considerable part of it, would so very soon have adopted the opinion of his having been a mere man. "To add to the dignity of their master was natural, but to take from it, and especially to degrade him

“ from being God to being man, must have been very unnatural.
 “ To make the Jews abandon the opinion of the divinity of
 “ Christ in the most qualified sense of the word, must at least
 “ have been as difficult, as we find it to be to make others give
 “ up the same opinion at this day; and there can be no ques-
 “ tion of their having for some time believed what the apos-
 “ tles taught on that, as well as on other subjects.

“ Of the same opinion with the Nazarenes and Ebionites,
 “ were those among the Gentiles, whom Epiphanius called
 “ *Alogi*, from their not receiving, as he says, the account that
 “ John gives of the *Logos*, and the writings of that apostle in
 “ general.” Dr. Lardner however, as referred to by Priest-
 ley, supposes that there was no ground for this charge, as it is
 mentioned by no person before him, and Epiphanius produc-
 es nothing but mere hearsay in support of it; but that it might
 have had its origin in their explaining the introduction of St.
 John’s gospel in a manner different from that writer and the
 orthodox of his day. Dr. Priestley thinks the conjecture of
 Epiphanius absurd, that these persons and others like them
 were those, that the apostle John meant by Antichrist. It is a
 much more natural inference, he thinks, since Epiphanius al-
 lows them to have existed in the times of the apostles, and to
 have existed without any particular name, till he endeavoured
 to force upon them that of *Alogi*; that in those early times they
 were not deemed heretical, but held the opinion of, or rather
 constituted, the ancient gentile church; “ and that, notwithstand-
 “ ing the introduction, and gradual prevalence of the opposite
 “ doctrine, they were suffered to pass uncensured, and conse-
 “ quently without a name, till the smallness of their numbers
 “ made them particularly noticed.”

The next argument in proof of the unitarianism of the an-
 cient Gentile Christians is from Irenæus, who wrote a large
 work on the subject of heresies (A. D. 172), and who did not
 reckon hereticks those, who held the simple doctrine of the hu-
 manity of Christ, without the disbelief of his miraculous con-
 ception.

Next follows a somewhat important argument from the
 modes of expression, which Justin Martyr (about A. D. 140)

uses in speaking of his own opinions of the preexistence and divinity of Christ, and of the opinions of those, who held his proper humanity, from which Dr. Priestley infers, that his own opinions were novel, and the others, those which generally prevailed. As this argument was the subject of much discussion, we shall defer any particular account of it to its place in the controversy.

The next argument is, that the unitarians in the primitive church always claimed, as is mentioned by Eusebius, to be the oldest Christians; and Dr. Priestley complains of the apparent unfairness of this historian in asserting that Theodotus (A. D. 190) was the first, who held that our Saviour was a mere man, when in his own writings alone he might have found a refutation of this assertion. "Epiphanius, speaking of the same Theodotus, says, that his heresy was a branch (*αποκλαση*) of that of the Alogi, which sufficiently implies, that they existed before him."

The Alogi therefore, says Dr. Priestley, appear to have been the earliest Gentile Christians; the same among the Gentiles, that the Ebionites were among the Jews.

We proceed to the second section, which treats "of the first step that was made toward the deification of Christ, by the personification of the Logos." The doctrines of the divinity and preexistence of Christ had their origin, according to Dr. Priestley, in a desire to remove the *stumbling block* and the *foolishness* of the cross, and an inclination to raise the character of our Saviour, and to accommodate Christianity to the philosophical opinions, which then prevailed. Men "could not submit," he observes, "to become the disciples of a man, who had been exposed upon a cross like the vilest malefactor" . . . "We," he adds, "who only learn from *history*, that crucifixion was a kind of death, to which slaves, and the vilest of malefactors were exposed, can but very imperfectly enter into their prejudices, so as to feel what they must have done with respect to it. The idea of a man executed at Tyburn, without any thing to distinguish him from common malefactors, is but an approach to the case of our Saviour." Some Christians, attached to the oriental or the Greek philosophy,

endeavoured to remove these prejudices, by raising the dignity of the person of Christ. The Gnostics represented the Christ, as one of the principal emanations from the divinity recognized in their system of opinions; and the Platonizing Christians, taking advantage of some modes of expression in scripture, regarded him as the Logos of the Platonic philosophy. Plato himself however, according to Dr. Priestley, though his writings have been otherwise represented, considered the Logos as nothing more than the attribute of intelligence in the Divinity; though the confusion of his ideas gave occasion to its personification,* or to something like it in his followers. He considered the Supreme Being himself, as the creator of all things, having for a pattern or exemplar, the permanent ideas in his own mind. To these ideas Plato gave the name of the invisible and intelligible world, and considered them as the type and counterpart of the visible. Their receptacle was the divine *nous* or *logos*. These ideas his followers spoke of, as the causes as well as the principles of things. But the notion of a cause, and that of a proper *author* or *person*, are nearly allied; and confounding, as they sometimes did, these ideas with their receptacle, the divine *nous* or *logos*, they fell into the habit of speaking of this latter, as the Demiurgus, or maker of the world; though they likewise speak of it, "as a mere *repository of ideas*, the *place of the intelligible world*, or the intelligible world itself, and no proper person." "There was however," says Dr. Priestley, "enough of personification, in what the Platonists said of the divine *nous* or *logos*, to give a handle to Philo and the Christian Fathers, to make a little more of it, which it was very convenient for their purposes to do."† But, according to Dr. Priestley, there is to be found in their writings, no uniform and serious personification of this principle, the attribute of intelligence in the Divinity, but only strongly figurative and obscure language used with regard to it, capable, if literally interpreted and not compared with other passages, of

* The word, 'personification,' is here used in a sense somewhat peculiar, to express, 'the being considered as a person.'

† History of Ear. Op. B. 2. c. vii. sect. 1.

bearing a construction expressive of its being considered as a person.

Philo, a Jew of Alexandria, contemporary with the apostles, a Platonist, first represented the Logos, or the Wisdom of God, as capable of being emitted from the Divine Being, and of assuming an occasional personality, and as being the visible Medium of all God's communications to man; that, by which he both made the world, and also conversed with the patriarchs of the Old Testament: the Logos, at different times, taking various forms, particularly that of angels, and being after these occasional emissions absorbed into the Divine Being again. This assumption of personality by the Logos, or this change of an attribute into an intelligent person, which Philo thought occasional, the Christian fathers, as a first step toward the doctrine of the Trinity, considered as a permanent assumption preceding the creation of the world: afterward they regarded this attribute as having always existed as a person; and, when they had made some progress in this doctrine, they proceeded to ascribe it to Plato himself. The Logos, thus made a person, was considered the Divine nature of Christ; and the Christian Fathers long held the doctrine, that Christ was nothing more than the *logos*, or the proper *reason*, *wisdom*, or *power* of the Father; though it contributed exceedingly to embarrass their scheme of the Trinity. "It is not possible," says Dr. Priestley in his History of Early Opinions, "either by the use of plain words, or of figurative language, to express this most absurd notion, viz. that the *logos* or the *son*, which was afterwards a *real person*, was originally nothing more than a mere *attribute of the Father*, more clearly, than they do." "Passages without end," he observes in the same work, "may also be selected from the most approved of the Fathers to shew, in the clearest manner, that as the divinity which they then ascribed to Christ, was the very same principle which had constituted the *wisdom* and other *operative powers* of God the Father, so what they called the *generation of the son*, was the commencement of a state of actual personality in the Logos; whether in time, as was thought by some, or from all eterni-

* ty, as was held by others; an opinion which was afterwards
 “received as the established doctrine on the subject.”*

In giving this very brief view of the doctrines of Platonism, of Philo, and of the Christian Fathers, relating to this subject, I have thought it preferable, not to confine myself to the work immediately before me; but to make use likewise of Dr. Priestley's *History of Early Opinions*, in which his views of these subjects are much more fully explained. By comparing what he has there written, with what he had before said in his *History of the Corruptions*, the latter will be better understood. In the work last mentioned, Dr. Priestley produces a considerable number of passages from the antenicene Fathers, in proof that they considered the divine nature of Christ, as nothing more than the Logos, the Wisdom, or the Word of God, which had assumed a substantial essence, and become a person; that they considered this change as the generation of the Son; and that they supposed it to have taken place in time; and to have been produced by the voluntary act of the Father. The most of these quotations with additional ones are repeated in his *History of Early Opinions*; and others are here produced, from the Fathers after the Nicene Council, to prove that they considered Christ, as the personified Logos of God.

The next Section in the *History of Corruptions* is to prove, “that Supremacy was always ascribed to the Father before the council of Nice.” Various passages are produced by Dr. Priestley in this and his larger work, which seem to prove, that the antenicene Fathers ascribed a decided and great superiority to the Father over the Son.

The fourth Section treats “of the difficulty, with which the doctrine of the divinity of Christ was established.” In this Section Dr. Priestley endeavours to shew, by quotations from the Fathers, that the majority of Christians, especially the unlearned, were shocked at the novel doctrine of the divinity of Christ, and opposed its introduction. One or two of these passages with additional ones, are given in the *History of Early Opinions*, under the head to which they most properly be-

* *History of Early Opinions*, B. 2. c. 2. s. 1.

long, as direct evidence, that unitarianism was the doctrine of the primitive Gentile churches.

The fifth Section contains "an account of the unitarians before the council of Nice." Dr. Priestley considers those as unitarians, who have been usually denominated Sabellians.

The sixth Section takes notice "of the Arian controversy." The difference between the orthodox before the councils of Nice and the Arians, is this, that while both asserted the Son to be inferior to the Father, the former held him to be the personified attribute of the Father, having existed from eternity as an attribute, though not as person, and the latter believed him to be a mere distinct being, created out of nothing. This difference is essential to be attended to; since, if it be true, the Arian doctrine can claim no higher antiquity than the fourth century.

The seventh Section treats "of the doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit." The four remaining sections give the History of the doctrine of the Trinity after the councils of Nice and Constantinople, and of the recovery of what, Dr. Priestley considers as the genuine doctrine of Christianity. Of these sections an abstract is not necessary. I shall proceed to give a short general view of the two publications, by which the controversy was opened; the Monthly Review of the First Part of Dr. Priestley's History, and Dr. Horsley's Charge to the Archdeaconry of St. Albans.

The Monthly Reviewer, after having given an account of some of Dr. Priestley's propositions and arguments, which however is rather brief and imperfect even with regard to those he undertakes to notice, thus commences his attack. "When we review the passages we have now transcribed, we are equally
"grieved and astonished. *Periculosum est in limine offendere!*
"We are grieved to see a writer of Dr. Priestley's eminence,
"and who hath long stood very high, even in the opinion of his
"enemies, for integrity of character, laying himself so open to the
"charge of perversion and misrepresentation. We are aston-
"ished at his rashness—though we know that great zeal doth
"not always listen to the more scrupulous dictates of prudence.
"But common sense should at least teach it to preserve a de-

"cent appearance, and in matters that fall within the circle of history, and where invention can have no play, a writer should be careful not to give his enemies cause for exultation by positive assertions, which are not only without proof, but in direct opposition to it."

In support of these rather serious accusations, there are seven articles, which follow. The first, which is very short, merely expresses the Reviewer's doubts of the identity of the Nazarenes and Ebionites. In the second there is an attempt to show that the inference, before mentioned, from the silence of Hegesippus respecting any heresy of the Ebionites, is without value. In the third Epiphanius' account of the Alogi is defended. The fourth commences with the author's stating that his, or in the reviewer's phrase, "our greatest objection lies against Dr. Priestley's representation of the opinions of Justin Martyr," and is accordingly occupied in the examination of Dr. Priestley's argument from this father. The fifth notices an error of Dr. Priestley in calling Victor the successor instead of the predecessor of Zephyrinus; and charges him with mistake in attributing to Eusebius what is said by a more ancient writer quoted by Eusebius; and with misrepresenting what is in fact said by this writer. In the sixth Dr. Priestley's assertion, that the doctrines of the preexistence and divinity of Christ can be traced no higher than Justin Martyr is noticed, and two passages are produced in contradiction to it, one from the Epistle attributed to Barnabas, and the other from the Epistle to the Ephesians attributed to Ignatius. The seventh remarks on what is said by Dr. Priestley, that the Shepherd of Hermas is not quoted by Irenæus, and represents this as a gross error. These are the seven articles, by which the general charges of the Reviewer are supported.

The tracts of Dr. Horsley in this controversy were collected, and published by himself, and from the preface to this collection we shall give his own account of his charge—"a review," he says, "of the imperfections of his (Dr. Priestley's) work in the first part, relating to our Lord's divinity, was made the subject of a charge, delivered to the clergy of the Archdeaconry of St. Albans, the spring next following Dr.

" Priestley's publication. The specimens alleged of the imperfections of the work, and the incompetency of its author, may be reduced to six general classes. Instances of reasoning in a circle; instances of quotations misapplied, through ignorance of the writer's subject; instances of testimonies perverted by artful and forced constructions; instances of passages in the Greek fathers, misinterpreted through ignorance of the Greek language; instances of passages misinterpreted, through the same ignorance driven farther out of the way by an ignorance of the Platonic philosophy; instances of ignorance of the phraseology of the earliest ecclesiastical writers."

In his charge, Dr. Horsley, after some introductory matter, proceeds to state, that the general scheme of Dr. Priestley is the same with that of Daniel Zuicker, a Prussian physician, a Socinian of the seventeenth century; and that his arguments are in all essential points the same with those of that writer or of Episcopius, who, " though himself," says Dr. Horsley, " no Socinian, very indiscreetly concurred with the Socinians of his time in maintaining, that the opinion of the mere humanity of Christ had prevailed very generally in the first ages." To these arguments, he says, an adequate reply has been made by Bishop Bull. He next notices a remark, with which Dr. Priestley begins his work, that it may be inferred that the doctrine of the mere humanity of Christ was the belief of the first ages, because it is the doctrine of scripture, as an instance of reasoning in a circle. In what manner we shall hereafter explain. He then proceeds to examine the argument that Dr. Priestley builds upon what he considers the silence of St. John, respecting any heresy of the Ebionites, when noticing that of the Gnostics. In quoting St. John's Epistle Dr. Priestley had, by an error of transcription or of the press, changed ' *in* ' to ' *of* ' in the passage " Jesus Christ is come *in* the flesh," reading it " Jesus Christ is come *of* the flesh," on which Horsley has much to remark. Under this head, he incidentally introduces a passage from the Epistle to the Magnesians, attributed to Ignatius, in proof of the early ascription of divinity to Christ. He next notices Dr. Priestley's quotation from Athanasius before mentioned. He then considers

the argument to be derived from the opinions of the Nazarenes and Ebionites; and endeavours to prove that the Nazarenes were orthodox on the subject of the Trinity, and were not the same persons with the Ebionites. He next observes upon Dr. Priestley's complaint of the unfairness of Eusebius, respecting the antiquity of the unitarian doctrine; and attempts to shew in support of that historian, that Theodotus (A. D. 190) was the first, who taught the *proper* unitarian doctrine, or at least the first, by whom the doctrine of Christ's mere humanity, in any sense, was taught at Rome. The remainder of the charge, excepting the conclusion, is occupied in the examination of Dr. Priestley's account of the gradual corruption of Christianity from the influence of the doctrines of Platonism. In this part Dr. Horsley contends, that Dr. Priestley has misunderstood a passage of Athenagoras quoted by him; and points out two passages from Theophilus, which he had mistranslated. These mistranslations Dr. Priestley acknowledged.

In Dr. Horsley, the author of the History of the Corruptions found the most formidable of his opponents; not that he has written so much, or so laboriously as Jamieson, nor was he, it may be, much superior to the Monthly Reviewer in acuteness of mind, or in knowledge of his subjects; but as a controversial writer he had powers far before either. His style is arrogant and overbearing, more laboured, and at least as insolent as that of Warburton, without however his force of mind, and his exuberance of learning. There is throughout his writings an imposing assurance of manner, to which a weak mind may give way; and there are many, perhaps, unable themselves in the perplexity of the controversy, or in his occasional and it may sometimes seem studied obscurity, to perceive the strength of his arguments, who yet receive an impression of the goodness of that cause, the confidence of whose defender never seems to falter. The learning, which it may appear that he sometimes borrowed for the occasion, he always uses as if it had been long his own; and subjects, with which it may be doubted whether he was very conversant, he commonly treats with an air of familiar acquaintance. He was however a man of various erudition, a mathe-

matician, a writer on metaphysics, a classical scholar, and a theologian. As a mathematician, however, I do not understand, that he holds a high rank; and as the editor and commentator of Newton, he is said to have left some things unaccomplished, which might fairly have been expected from one, who undertook that office. Of metaphysical acumen he seems to have had but little. Of his classical learning he has left no specimens sufficient to enable us to form a judgment. As a theologian, I do not find that his translation of Hosea has more than a moderate share of reputation, or that the translation of the whole Hebrew scriptures, which he is said to have left among his papers, is expected with much solicitude. His posthumous sermons have been highly praised, particularly by a writer in the *Edinburgh Review*; but in reading those, that were in this review pointed out for their excellence, together with some others, I have not been able to discover an high degree of merit, and was led to suspect, that some other cause, beside the value of the sermons, might have given occasion to this very favourable criticism. His style, in these sermons, as well as in the present controversy, is studied, and generally with considerable effect; sometimes however forming a contrast with the triteness of the idea, or the obviousness of the statement or explanation, about which it is employed. In the arts of controversy few have been better skilled than Dr. Horsley. Those errors of his opponent, which a more careless controversialist might have passed over with a transient notice, he seizes, and drags to light, and holds in view, and having quitted them once returns to them again, till they swell under his hands to a portentous magnitude. When it was difficult to reply to the matter of an argument, he knew how to detect something in the form of its statement, which might afford opportunity for evasion at least, if not for triumph also. None could better improve an advantage, or assume in all circumstances an air of greater sturdiness and defiance. It might have been difficult for any one more frequently, or in more various ways than he has done, to inculcate a sense of his own erudition, and of his contempt for the learning and abilities of his opponent, with respect to the matters in dispute. Besides all this, however, he

brought to the controversy more than common acquaintance with its different subjects, an unusual strength of style, and no contemptible powers of arguing, if not on abstract subjects, yet with regard to facts and historical questions. There are too, at least in his earlier publications against Dr. Priestley, occasional expressions of catholic feelings, and of respect for his opponent, (I by no means refer to a passage, the conclusion of his remarks upon Dr. Priestley's Second Letter, which I have lately seen quoted as a specimen of these feelings,) which, if they contrast rather harshly with his general style, do yet give us a favorable impression of the character of their author.

With regard to Dr. Priestley, his style is perspicuous and simple in an uncommon degree; for his ideas were clear, definite, and well arranged. He appears to have had a strong feeling of the truth, and of the importance of what he maintained. He always composed rapidly, and in this controversy there are generally marks of haste in his style, and sometimes of carelessness. Subsequent to his third series of letters to Dr. Horsley, in which he defends the veracity of Origen against Dr. Horsley's attack, and urges him to reply, and on this subject at least bring the controversy to an issue, after an interval of about six months, long before Dr. Horsley made any answer, Dr. Priestley published his Letters to the Dean of Canterbury. In these letters he says; "had any person called upon me in this manner, he would have had my reply (either vindicating myself or acknowledging my inability to do it) in a week, or as soon as it had been physically possible for it to be dispatched." In his preface to his first Reply to the Monthly Reviewer he says, "But my object I hope is not reputation; (I write a great deal too much for that;) but the careful investigation and the most effectual propagation of truth; and for this purpose I am willing to lay hold of every fair opportunity of bringing it again and again before the public."

There were in Dr. Priestley's writings on the subject of this controversy errors with regard to facts, and in the citation of his authorities; but it is doubtful whether a smaller number would be found in any works of the same extent on similar subjects, if subjected to a scrutiny as repeated and severe as these

have been; one, to which very few writings have been exposed. "I am well aware," he says in his preface to his first Letters to Dr. Horsley, "of the nature and force of that opposition and obloquy, to which I am exposing myself, in consequence of writing my *History of the Corruptions of Christianity*, the most valuable, I trust, of all my publications; and especially in consequence of the pains, that have been taken to magnify and expose a few inaccuracies, to which all works of a similar nature have been and ever must be subject. But I have the fullest persuasion, that the real oversights in it are of the smallest magnitude, and do not at all affect any one position or argument in my work, as I hope to satisfy all candid judges; and as to mere cavil and reproach, I thank God, I am well able to bear it." All the errors in his first edition of the *History of the Corruptions*, which he acknowledged to be such, he has corrected in the subsequent editions. Reasoning without any particular knowledge of this controversy, one would not conclude, that Dr. Priestley was in respect to facts, or the use of authorities, a careless writer. He has composed two works, his *History of Electricity* and that of *Optics*, in which he had occasion to consult a great number of authorities, and to adduce a great variety of facts, and the accuracy of these has not been made a question, nor their high value denied. Even in the work, which produced the present controversy, the *History of the Corruptions*, the Monthly Reviewer has not attempted to point out errors in any Part except the first. If it be said, that in this First Part his judgment was perverted, and he was led into gross misrepresentations by the force of prejudice and prepossession; it may be replied, that few writers seem to have had more fairness of mind, and more openness to conviction. If the direct charge of dishonesty be made, it may be said in answer, that this charge will not attach itself very readily to one, concerning whom the Monthly Reviewer, in the very attempt to insinuate something like it, confesses, that he "hath long stood high, even in the opinion of his enemies, for integrity of character;" and of whom Dr. Horsley in the bitterness of controversy, with a liberality which does him honor, however inconsistent with what may be found in other passages of his writ-

ings, uses the following language: "If I have any where expressed myself contemptuously, the contempt is not of you, but of your argument upon a particular subject, upon which I truly think you argue very weakly; and of your information upon a point, in which I truly think you are ill informed. This hinders not, but that I may entertain the respect, which I profess, for your learning in other subjects; for your abilities in all subjects in which you are learned; and a cordial esteem and affection for the virtues of your character, which I believe to be great and amiable." I will produce in favor of Dr. Priestley, one other testimony of a later writer, not less opposed to his metaphysics, than those whom I have just quoted were to his theology. "How widely soever," says Professor Stewart, in his *Essays* lately published, "I may dissent from most of his [Dr. Priestley's] philosophical tenets, nobody can be disposed to judge more favorably, than myself, of the motives from which he wrote."* I quote this passage the more readily, as it gives me an opportunity of producing at the same time, perhaps the highest living authority, in opposition to the metaphysical opinions of Dr. Priestley.

After having thus endeavoured to give a general view of the state of the controversy, and of the particular points in dispute; of the publications in which it is contained, and of some traits of character in the two principal persons engaged in it; I shall at present only proceed to notice particularly one objection to the statements of Dr. Priestley, which if established may seem, and perhaps not unreasonably, to supersede the necessity of any other, and which in fact would, with regard to some of his statements, be decisive of their error. It is maintained, that so far from the doctrine of Christ's divinity being an innovation of the times of Justin Martyr, that is, of the second century, passages, on the contrary, declarative of this doctrine, are to be found in the writings of the apostolic Fathers,† that is, of

* P. 174, Amer. Ed.

† There are certain writings, attributed to persons considered to have been contemporary with the apostles, which are called the works of the Apostolic Fathers: viz. an epistle attributed to Barnabas, the companion of Paul; some works attributed to Clemens Romanus, supposed to be the Clement mentioned Phil. iv. 3., all which are now universally considered

persons contemporary with the apostles themselves. The Monthly Reviewer, after observing that "Dr. Priestley himself hath quoted more than once the Epistle to Barnabas, without dropping an hint that he suspected its authenticity," and after affirming it to be "undoubtedly of very high antiquity, whether written by Barnabas or not," proceeds to quote from it the following passage, as a "plain declaration of the preexistence of Christ:" "And on this account, the Lord himself was satisfied to undergo punishments for the sake of our souls, notwithstanding his dominion over the whole earth; to whom God said before the beginning of the world; 'Let us make man after our own image and likeness.'" He gives likewise the following quotation from the Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians: "There is one physician, who is to be considered in a double view, as fleshly and as spiritual, as made and not made, God incarnate, real life in death, begotten of Mary and of God, in one respect liable to suffering and in another incapable of it, even Jesus Christ our Lord." Dr. Horsley in his charge, cites the following passage from Clemens Romanus, in proof of the preexistent dignity of Christ: "The sceptre of the majesty of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, came not in the pomp of pride and arrogance, although he had it in his power." He quotes also the following passage from the Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians: "There is one God, who hath manifested himself through Jesus Christ his Son, who is his eternal Word, who came not forth from silence." This passage, he says, "contains an evident assertion of the Divinity of the Son of God. And this assertion being found in the writings of Ignatius, the familiar friend and companion of the Apostles, who suffered martyrdom so early as the sixteenth year of the second century, and had been appointed to the bishopric of Antioch, full thirty years before, is an unanswerable refutation of our author's spurious, except one epistle to the Corinthians; a work, called "The Shepherd of Hermas," containing the representation of a vision, attributed to the Hermes, mentioned Romans xvi. 14. Epistles, ascribed to Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, supposed to have been written about A. D. 107; or, according to some, A. D. 166; and one Epistle to the Corinthians, ascribed to Polycarp, who is said to have been the disciple of St. John

“ confident assertions, ‘ that we find nothing like divinity attributed to Jesus Christ before Justin Martyr;’ and, ‘ that all the early fathers speak of Christ, as not having existed always.’” With regard to Ignatius, Dr. Horsley likewise says in his Charge, “ that he hardly ever mentions Christ without introducing some explicit assertion of his Divinity, or without joining with the name of Christ some epithet in which it is implied.” In the eighth of his first Letters to Dr. Priestley, he produces what he calls “ a positive proof, that the divinity of our Lord was the belief of the very first Christians.” This proof consists in passages from the Epistle of Barnabas. Of this Epistle he says to Dr. Priestley; “ It is quoted, you know, by Clemens Alexandrinus, not to mention later writers, as the composition of Barnabas the Apostle. Take no alarm, Sir, I shall not claim a place for it in the canon. I shall not contend, that any Apostle was its author. I am well persuaded of the contrary.” “ I suppose however that you will allow, what all allow, that the book is a production of the Apostolic age: in the fifth section of your History of the Doctrine of Atonement, you quote it among the writings of the Apostolic fathers. I think it fair to remind you of this circumstance, lest you should hastily advance a contrary opinion, when you find the testimony of this writer turned against you.” The reasons, why Horsley does not consider it the work of Barnabas, are from internal evidence, and are the same, which have been assigned by other writers.* They are its mean style, its strained allegories, and its weak and absurd reasonings. If however it be a writing of the apostolic age, it is still a very important witness. The first passage quoted by Dr. Horsley, is the same, which had been previously quoted by the Monthly Reviewer, and which we have already given. It is likewise to be found in Bishop Bull’s *Defensio Fidei Nicænæ*, Sect. 1. cap. ii. § 2. The next passage, which is also given by Bishop Bull, (*ubi sup.*) is as follows.—“ For if he had not come in the flesh, how could we mortals seeing him have been preserved; when they who behold the sun, which is to perish, and is the work of his hands, are unable to look directly against its rays.” Dr. Horsley refers to

* See Marsh’s *Michaelis*, Vol. iv. p. 258. seq.

Deut. xviii. 16. Exod. xxxiii. 20. Judges vi. 23. and xiii. 22. and proceeds: "Again—' if then the Son of God, being Lord, and being to judge the quick and dead, suffered to the end that his wound might make us alive; let us believe that the Son of God had no power to suffer, had it not been for us.' And again, ' Meanwhile thou hast (the whole doctrine) concerning the majesty of Christ; how all things were made for him and through him; to whom be honor, power, and glory, now and forever.' He who penned these sentences was surely a devout believer in our Lord's divinity. It is needless to observe, that he was a Christian; and almost as needless to observe, that he had been a Jew. For in that age, none but a person bred in Judaism, could possess that minute knowledge of the Jewish rites, which is displayed in this book. In the writer therefore of the Epistle of St. Barnabas, we have one instance of a Hebrew Christian of the Apostolic age, who believed in our Lord's divinity."*

To all this Dr. Priestley replies. First with regard to the quotation in Dr. Horsley's Charge from Clemens Romanus, in which it is said, "The sceptre of the majesty of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, came not in the pomp of pride and arrogance, although he had it in his power." "The phrase," says Dr. Priestley, "is easily explained, by his entering on his commission as a public teacher; when being invested with the power of working miracles, he never made any ostentatious display of it, or indeed exerted it for his own benefit in any respect."† The probability of this interpretation is denied by Horsley, as not agreeing with the context, and defended by Priestley, on the ground of its coincidence. "He came not," says Clemens, "in the pomp of pride and arrogance,

* As Dr. Priestley has not directly noticed this concluding observation, it may be remarked, that Michaelis has inferred, that Barnabas was not the author of this epistle, partly from the author's ignorance in regard to the Hebrew letters, (see Marsh's Michaelis, vol. iv. p. 261.) and that Jones, the preceptor of Lardner, (himself a believer in the Trinity,) has produced various arguments to show, that this epistle was not written by a Jew, but by a Gentile; particularly from the constant opposition between the Jews and the Gentiles in the course of the work, and from the writer's always ranking himself with the latter. (See Priest. Hist. Ear. Opp. i. 28.)

† First Letters to Horsley, Let. 1.

"although he had it in his power; but in humility, as the Holy Spirit spake concerning him." Clemens then, to shew what the Holy Spirit did speak concerning him, proceeds to cite some prophecies which "describe the Messiah's low condition," to use the words of Horsley himself, and according to Priestley, "not the circumstances of his *birth*, but only those of his public life and death; the principal of them being Is. liii, which he quotes almost at full length."* Horsley likewise mentions Jerome's translation of the passage, which is in these words; "Sceptrum Dei, Dominus Jesus Christus, non venit in jactantia superbiæ, cum possit omnia;" from which it appears, that he read *καὶ τὰ πάντα δυνατός*, 'although he had *all things* in his power,' instead of *καὶ τὰς δυνάμεις*, 'although he had it in his power,' the present reading. It thus appears, according to Horsley, that the last clause was originally, "an assertion of our Lord's omnipotence."† Dr. Priestley says in reply, that he considers this reading of Jerome, as evidently favorable to his interpretation of this passage; and that the phrase, "having all power," naturally alludes to the great power, of which Christ became possessed, after the descent of the Spirit of God upon him, at his baptism. "That is," says Horsley in reply, "to affirm that a person hath *all things* in his power, is, in Dr. Priestley's apprehension of the term, to affirm that at a certain time he had some things in his power."‡ This is contained in one of the additional notes to Horsley's Collection of his Tracts, and was never noticed by Dr. Priestley. A great part of the false criticism upon controverted passages, (and especially upon controverted passages in the New Testament,) seems to arise from real ignorance of the use of language. In a vast majority of instances, in which the phrase "all things" occurs without any particular limitation, if we except those in which it is used concerning God, it has not its literal meaning, nor any signification of proper universality. It does for the most part mean "some things," and indeed "a very few things," compared with what it may intend when most literally understood,

* Letters to Dr. Priestley, Letter 5.

† Second Letters to Horsley, Let. 2.

‡ Letters to Dr. Priestley, Let. 5. Additional Note.

Its signification is commonly limited by the reason of the thing, and the nature of the case, in which it is used. According to the mode of interpretation, which Dr. Horsley has adopted, it might be shewn, that the Corinthians were lords of the universe, for St. Paul affirmed to them; "all things are yours;"* that St. Paul himself had the attribute of omnipotence conferred upon him, for he says; "I can do all things, through him, that strengtheneth me;"† that the Christians, whom St. John addressed, were omniscient, for he tells them; "ye know all things;"‡ and even stranger inferences might be made, for St. Paul says, that there were some, who believed that they might "eat all things."§ From the phrase, "having all power," nothing can be inferred concerning omnipotence, in the Being to whom it is applied. It may be, and it is, used in a great variety of senses, short of designing this attribute of God. Dr. Horsley makes another objection to Dr. Priestley's interpretation, which is founded on Jerome's Latin, and not on the supposed Greek, to which this must answer, and is of course of little importance, as it is the opinion of Clemens Romanus and not of Jerome, which is in question; and there is no dispute with regard to the faith of the latter, in the doctrine of the divinity of Christ.

In the First Epistle of Clemens there occurs likewise, as is noticed by Dr. Priestley in his History of Early Opinions, the phrase *παθηματα αυτου*, i. e. *his*, "the sufferings of God:" "but this," says Dr. Priestley, "is language so exceedingly shocking and unscriptural, that it is hardly possible to think that it could be used by any writer so near to the time of the apostles, and Junius, who was far from having my objections to it, was of the opinion, that the whole passage was much corrupted, and that instead of *παθηματα αυτου*, i. e. *his*, we ought to read, *παθηματα αυτου*."|| To this Jamieson replies, that the language "may be shocking to Dr. Priestley, who does not believe that God purchased the church with his own blood. But

* 1 Cor. iii. 21.

† Phil. iv. 13.

‡ 1 John ii. 20.

§ Rom. xiv. 2.

|| Hist. Ear. Opp. B. i. c. 1.

"this will not prove that Clemens would have been shocked at such language."* The spuriousness of the passage, to which Jamieson thus appeals, is now, I suppose, pretty generally conceded. He adds, following Grabe, (*Additions to Bull's Defence*, ch. iii. § 3.) to whom he appeals, that the conjecture of Junius is supported by no manuscript, and is improbable, because, as he says has been observed by Grabe [*ubi sup.*], "there are scarcely two letters, which differ more in the best MSS. than Π and M ." For the last assertion I have not been able to find the authority of Grabe as referred to, and it is itself obviously incorrect. The assertion that the reading is supported by no MS. is true; yet perhaps there is something of unfairness, in a statement, which seems to imply the existence of a number of MSS. of the Epistle, when in fact there is only one extant, that connected with the Alexandrine MS. of the scriptures. Jamieson however was very probably ignorant of this fact, and merely followed what he found in Grabe respecting the want of manuscript authority.

With regard to the quotations from Ignatius, Dr. Priestley replies first to the Monthly Reviewer: "As to the epistles of Ignatius, I consider them all, the *less* as well as the *greater*,† as being either wholly spurious, or so corrupted as not to be quoted with safety; and I am far from being original or singular in this opinion." He then gives the opinion of Dr. Lardner, who thinks the smaller epistles in the main genuine, but that they may have been interpolated by the Arians, or the orthodox, or both. After this he proceeds, "Salmasius, Blondel, and Daillé, are decided that all the epistles are spurious; and Le Sueur, after giving an account of the whole matter,

* Jamieson Vind. B. v. c. 1.

† Besides some Epistles attributed to Ignatius, which may be put out of view, as being universally considered spurious, there are seven others, which exist in two different forms, the greater and the less, of which the latter is either an abridgement of the former, or the former an interpolated edition of the latter. It is the authenticity of the lesser epistles, which is contended for by Pearson, and in general by those, who receive as authentic any works attributed to Ignatius. These lesser epistles are orthodox, the larger favor the Arian doctrine. Whiston, who was probably prejudiced in their favor by this circumstance, maintained that the larger were the true copies.

"says, that the last of them, viz. Mr. Daillé, has clearly proved that the first, or smaller collection of Ignatius' Epistles, was forged about the beginning of the fourth century, or two hundred years after the death of Ignatius, and that the second, or larger collection, was made at the beginning of the sixth century."* To this the Monthly Reviewer made no reply except declining to enter into any controversy, respecting the genuineness of these Epistles, and claiming the weight of authority, among the learned, in their favor."†

To Dr. Horsley, Dr. Priestley gave a similar answer.* He allows that what Dr. Horsley says, concerning Ignatius' hardly ever introducing the name of Christ, without some mention of his divinity, "is very true, according to our present copies of Ignatius' epistles. But," he adds, "you must know that the genuineness of them is not only very much doubted; but generally given up by the learned, and it was not perfectly ingenuous in you to conceal this circumstance: First prove those epistles, as we now have them, to be the genuine writings of Ignatius, and then make all the use of them that you can."‡

To this Dr. Horsley replies; "Sir, if the genuineness of these epistles be generally given up by the learned, my ignorance, not my ingenuity, is to be blamed, that I cited them as genuine. I indeed knew nothing of this general giving up." He then gives an account of the seven epistles of Ignatius, which I have before mentioned in a note, and says; "with a majority of the learned these seven epistles are received as authentic; and the shorter edition is supposed to exhibit the genuine text. This at least was the opinion of Isaac Vossius, Usher, Hammond, Petavius, Grotius, Pearson, Bull, Cave, Wake, Cotelerius, Grabe, Dupin, Tillemont, Le Clerc.§ On the other side stand no names to be compared with these, except the three of Salmasius, Blondel, and Dalaus." Mosheim, he observes, holds a middle opinion,

* Reply to the Monthly Review for June, pp. 35, 36.

† Review, Vol. lxi. p. 240.

‡ First Letters to Dr. Horsley, Let. 1.

§ To these authorities he adds in a postscript, Fabricius.

thinking the question of preference between the two editions undecided; that whichever be preferred, the suspicion of interpolation and corruption cannot be entirely removed; that these epistles are, however, of great antiquity, and that it is highly credible, that they are not altogether forgeries, and that their authenticity would never have been called in question, if the Presbyterian divines* had not wished to evade the arguments drawn from them, in favor of episcopacy. Dr. Horsley then quotes the opinion of Lardner, in these words; "After suggesting," according to Dr. Horsley, "in no very confident language, that 'even the smaller epistles may have been tampered with by the Arians, or the orthodox, or both;' he adds, 'I do not affirm, that there are in them any considerable corruptions or alterations.' If no considerable corruptions or alterations," observes Dr. Horsley, "certainly none respecting a point of such importance as the original nature of Christ."† "This," says Dr. Priestley in reply, "is curious indeed. What then could Dr. Lardner mean by these epistles having been *tampered with by the Arians, the Orthodox, or both?* If *they* interpolated them at all, it would certainly be to introduce into them passages favorable to their opinions concerning the divinity or preexistence of Christ. How would it be worth their while, *as Arians or Orthodox*, to interpolate them for any other purpose? If a farmer, hearing of some depredation on his property, committed by foxes, should say, my *corn* may have been plundered, but as the mischief has been done by *foxes*, my *geese* and my *poultry* are safe; what would be said of his reasoning? Yet of the same nature is yours in this case.

"These foxes have not refrained from their prey," adds Dr. Priestley, "in more sacred inclosures than those of Ignatius. —Sir Isaac Newton, among others, has clearly proved that the orthodox, as they are commonly called, have, in this way, *tampered* with the New Testament itself; having made interpolations favorable to the doctrine of the trinity; especially the

* See a fine argument against the entire genuineness of these epistles in Campbell's Lect. Eccl. Hist. L. vi.

† Letters to Priestley, Let. 5.

" famous passage concerning the *three that bear record in heaven*, in the first epistle of John. This I should imagine, " you yourself will acknowledge; and can you think they " would spare the epistles of Ignatius, which were much more " in their power?"*

He next quotes Jortin, as suspecting alterations in the shorter epistles, and observes; " For my own part I scruple not to " say, that there never were more evident marks of interpolation in any writings, than are to be found in these genuine " epistles, as they are called, of Ignatius, though I am willing " to allow, on reconsidering them, that, exclusive of manifest " interpolations, there may be a ground work of antiquity in " them."* Dr. Horsley, immediately after the quotation last given from him, adds, " I will, therefore, still appeal to these " epistles, as sufficiently sincere, to be decisive of the point in " dispute. Nor shall I think myself obliged to go into the " proof of their authenticity, till you have given a satisfactory " reply to every part of Bishop Pearson's elaborate defence: a " work, which I suspect you have not yet *looked through*." " And I sir," says Dr. Priestley, " shall save myself that trouble, till you shall have replied to every part of *Larroque's answer to this work of Pearson*, a work, which I suspect you " have not *looked into*."*

The principal reply of Dr. Priestley, respecting the quotations from the Epistle of Barnabas, is of the same kind as respecting those of Ignatius. " It is almost certainly spurious " and unquestionably interpolated, beside that the time, when " it was written, cannot be ascertained."† A similar reply is likewise made respecting any quotations, that might be adduced from the shepherd of Hermas. We are ignorant of the true writer, and of the age of the composition. In his opinion concerning the spuriousness of the epistle of Barnabas, Dr. Priestley seems gradually to have been confirmed, for, in his first reply to the Monthly Reviewer, he says, " It is true that " I have quoted the epistle of Barnabas without saying any " thing about its authority. In reality, I do not know what to

* Second Letters to Horsley, Let. 2.

† Hist. of Ear. Opp. B. 1 c. 1.

"think of it, and my critic must know that the genuineness of
"it has been much disputed."*

This then is the ground, which Dr. Priestley has taken, with regard to the writings of the apostolic fathers, as they are called. He endeavours to answer, particularly, any arguments drawn from the epistle of Clemens, the genuineness of which he acknowledges; but in respect to the other writings attributed to the apostolic age, which are quoted in this controversy, he contends, that many of them are spurious, that the age of these is uncertain, and that those, which perhaps are not altogether spurious, together with the epistle of Barnabas, which probably is so, are manifestly interpolated, and this, in respect to the very doctrine in controversy; and therefore, that any arguments drawn from them, respecting the points in dispute, are entirely without value.

This opinion of the spuriousness, and corrupt state of these writings, probably prevails even more generally among the learned at the present day, than it did at the time of Dr. Priestley's writing, and has even extended itself to the first epistle of Clemens, which Dr. Priestley considered genuine. I shall quote, on this subject, the opinion of the very learned commentator on Michaelis, who will hardly be suspected of having any prejudices in favor of the opinions of Dr. Priestley, or those of the presbyterian divines; and likewise, what is said by Semler, to whom he refers. "Not only the adversaries," says Herbert Marsh, "but also the friends of Christianity have suspected the authenticity of the writings ascribed to the apostolic fathers, notwithstanding the immense erudition bestowed on them by Cotelier, Usher, Pearson, Le Clerc, and others at the end of the last, and beginning of the present century. Lardner has clearly shewn that all the works of Clement are spurious, except his first epistle to the Corinthians; but even that is suspected by our author, [Michaelis;] and Dr. Semler, who has made a more particular study of ecclesiastical history perhaps than any man that ever lived, doubts the authenticity of all the writings ascribed to the apostolic fathers. See Semleri Hist. Eccles. selecta capita, Tom. I.

* Reply, page 38.

“ p. 25. *Commentarii Historici de antiquo Christianorum*
 “ *statu*, Tom. I. p. 39, 40. and his *Novæ Observationes* qui-
 “ *bus studiosius illustrantur potiora capita hist. et rel. Christ.*
 “ *usque ad Constantinum*, p. 15, 24, 40. This at least is cer-
 “ tain, that passages are found in these writings, which from
 “ the nature of the subjects could not have existed in the first
 “ century, and if they prove not the whole to be spurious, they
 “ prove at least, that these writings have been so interpolated,
 “ as to make it difficult to distinguish what is genuine from
 “ what is false.*

Of the *Novæ Observationes* of Semler we have never seen a copy, and doubt whether one is to be found in our country. The following is the passage above referred to in the *Com. de antiq. Christ. stat.* with its translation.

“ *Præter istas scriptiones, quarum ignorantur auctores, no-*
 “ *mina certe illorum prodi numquam solebant, recensentur et*
 “ *alii scriptores e christianis, quos olim plerosque omnes hu-*
 “ *ic seculo primo atque secundo ineunti assignabant. Clemens*
 “ *aliquis, quem romanum postea dixerunt, vt ab Alexandrino*
 “ *illo seriori facilius distingueretur; ei 2 epistolas ad Corinthi-*
 “ *os tribuunt graecas, sicut Syri etiam 2 ferebant, quas primus*
 “ *edidit Wetsenius. E graecis primam plerique tenent quasi*
 “ *ingenuam; nos vtramque graecam syrasque ablicimus, vt*
 “ *fictas. Eiusdem Clementis nomine Canones Apostolorum nu-*
 “ *mero 85. Constitutiones Apostolorum libri 8. Recognitiones*
 “ *Clementis, et Homilias suffecerunt moleste sedula studia ho-*
 “ *minum, seculo 1. et 2. quod dubitare nequit, posteriorum;*
 “ *Alexandria videntur primum lucem vidisse illae scriptiones;*
 “ *auctori non vni tribuendae, qui partim potestatem clericorum,*
 “ *et externae religionis auctoritatem commendatum iuerunt,*
 “ *partim Petri studiosis placere voluerunt. E recentioribus*
 “ *Whistonus istas scriptiones omnes magno conatu diuinitatis*
 “ *honore augere studuit. Aliud latinæ similiter originis no-*
 “ *men, Ignatius, Antiochiae ep. inter apostolicos patres, vt so-*
 “ *lent, licet incerti et dubii scriptores, nominari, superest; cu-*
 “ *ius plures epistolas graecas plerique in magno honore habe-*

* Michaelis, note to Vol. i. c. 2. s. 6.

“bant; dissentiunt alii, vtrum septem illae in itinere Romano,
 “si placet, sub an 116, scriptae, copiosiores, an breuiores, sint
 “omnino genuinae; magna enim est recensio diuersitas;
 “nos omnes, etiam illam ad *Polycarpum*, reiicimus, quia fictae
 “sunt et varie interpolatae, satis inuenisti etiam et puerilis fe-
 “re argumenti. Secundum etiam seculum fere medium atti-
 “gisse narratur *Polycarpus*, Smyrnensis ep. cuius ad *Philippen-
 “ses* fertur epistola; incertae et haec est fidei; *Barnabae* au-
 “tem, nempe qui Pauli comes fuerit, si fabulae credimus, epis-
 “tolam graecam olim amabant, vt *Hermac* illos tres libros fa-
 “naticos; (seculi secundi sunt,) isti omnes libelli in corpore
 “*Cotelerii* illo et *Clerici* satis grandi habentur, eruditorum vi-
 “rorum variis studiis illustrati. *Latinae* antiquae illorum
 “*translationes* ecclesiastico stilo recte intelligendo vtilis sunt;
 “ceterum pleraque omnia videntur *Alexandrinis* deberi homi-
 “nibus, qui parum graue et dignum esse statuerunt, nomina
 “tanta celebrari, scripta autem nulla hos auctores posteritati
 “praeceptores transmittere. De auctorum ingenio et pectoris
 “mediocri indole ex his scriptionibus iudicare licet, quibus,
 “audeo dicere, nihil quicquam decoris aut honoris ad Chris-
 “tianismum accessit, multum potius damni succreuit.”

“Besides those writings,” says Semler, “whose authors are un-
 known, their names never having been transmitted, other Chris-
 tian writers are enumerated, almost all of whom were formerly
 supposed to belong to the first century, or to the beginning of the
 second. Such as Clemens, (called Clemens Romanus, that he
 might be distinguished from Clemens Alexandrinus, who lived
 after him,) to whom two epistles to the Corinthians, in Greek,
 are attributed, and two, also, in Syriac; which latter were first
 published by Wetstein. The first of the Greek epistles is gen-
 erally considered genuine, but we reject them all, both Greek
 and Syriac, as spurious. The officious labours of some per-
 sons, who, there can be no doubt, lived later than the first or
 second century, have produced, in the name of the same Cle-
 mens, the Apostolic Canons, eighty-five in number; the Apos-
 tolic Constitutions, of which there are eight books; the Recog-
 nitions and the Homilies of Clemens. These writings seem to
 have first appeared at Alexandria. They are not to be viewed as

the work of our author, their design being, partly, to support the power of the clergy, and the authority of the church, and partly, to please the admirers of Peter. Whiston is distinguished among the moderns, for his great exertions, to obtain for these writings the rank of sacred books. Another name, likewise of Latin derivation, is to be mentioned among the apostolic fathers, as they are called, though it is very doubtful who these writers were, which is, Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, whose numerous Greek epistles were by many held in high estimation. It is a question with others, whether, of the seven epistles which were written on his journey to Rome, perhaps in the year 116, the larger or the shorter edition is to be considered entirely genuine; for there is a great difference in the editions. We reject them all, even that to Polycarp: for they are forgeries, and interpolated in various ways, and their subjects are mean, and almost childish. An epistle to the Philipians is attributed to Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, who is said to have lived to the middle of the second century. The authority of this also is doubtful. An epistle of Barnabas, (that Barnabas, indeed, who was the companion of St. Paul, if the story be credible,) was formerly much esteemed, as were the three fanatical books of Hermas. These belong to the second century. All these works may be found in the extensive collection, made by Cotelierius and Le Clerc, illustrated by various labors of learned men. Their ancient Latin translations are of use in throwing light upon the ecclesiastical style of writing. We are probably indebted for most of them to some persons of Alexandria, who thought it not proper that men, whose names were so much celebrated, should have left no writings, for the instruction of posterity. A judgment may be formed of the capacity, and moderate ability of the authors from these works, from which, I dare affirm, Christianity has derived neither honor nor credit; but, on the contrary, has received much injury."

In Semler's *Selecta Capita*, which is an earlier publication, than that from which I have quoted, there is nothing of importance relating to the writings in controversy, that is not repeated in his later work.

Such then seems to be the opinion of the learned, respecting one of the principal points in controversy between Dr. Priestley and his opponents.

(To be continued.)

[For the following translation we are indebted to a gentleman, from whose friendship and whose various learning we hope for other favors. It is taken from a publication of Eichhorn's well known, at least by name, to the learned. Its German title is given below, and may be thus translated; "The Universal Library of Biblical Literature." It is a periodical publication, containing writings relating to theological subjects. We suppose the lives of few men will be more interesting to the theological student, than that of Semler. The biography is probably written by Eichhorn himself. Ed.]

BIOGRAPHY OF J. S. SEMLER :

Translated from the original, in Eichhorn's Allgemeine Bibliothek der Biblischen Litteratur. Band. 5. Theil. 1.

Leipzig, 1793.

John Solomon Semler:

Born 18th December, 1725, died 14th March, 1791.

TO the rare moral and literary phenomena of the present century, now drawing to a close, belongs, without dispute, the celebrated Doctor Semler, whose loss our literature has recently been called to deplore. What was theology in Germany when he took it in charge from the hands of Baumgarten? And what has it now become through that kind of care, which he first took, and in which others followed him? A full quarter of a century he was employed in disrobing this science of the old and squalid garments, which Platonists and scholastics had thrown about her, and in bringing her back, renovated and endowed with new charms, to a reconciliation with her sister, philosophy, who had threatened wholly to reject her. From the time of these his first efforts, his German contemporaries were not indifferent to his claims. They were di-

* [Sigismund Jacob Baumgarten. He was professor of theology at Halle; he was born 1706, he died 1757; leaving numerous writings on theological subjects, and many translations of French and English works into German. Ed.]

vided into parties on his account, which admired or despised, which praised or blamed him; but on whichever side they enlisted, they all agreed in acknowledging that his character was irreproachable.

At length, however, the direction of his own mind and the voice of his contemporaries concerning him, were suddenly changed. From the way, in which he had so long indefatigably proceeded, he unexpectedly returned; and destroyed with his own hands the fabric, which he had erected with great exertions, and to which he had dedicated the full strength of his best years. All were now dissatisfied with him. They, who had formerly admired him for his supposed deserts, became his opposers, and his former opposers remained as before, averse from him and every thing he did. He lost all public approbation: and the last twelve years of his life were passed in sorrow and regret, that after so many years of exertion, he had outlived himself. After being for a time morally dead, the news of his actual decease was at length received with coldness and indifference.

It is a question whether posterity will reverence his great name more than his contemporaries have done. The writings of the most distinguished period of his life do indeed shed great light upon theology, and richly reward a diligent examination. But, because they were by turns blamed and praised, admired and calumniated, many of his contemporaries, for the sake of their reputation, used them only in silence; and thus his sentiments, without passing under his name, imperceptibly obtained circulation among our theologians. Still his writings are read only by a few; for it is a difficult task, on account of the total want of a regular, pleasant, and properly arranged style and manner, to become possessed of their contents. In short, none will give them a thorough perusal, but the most curious among the *literati*; because almost every thing that they contain of what is good, novel, great, or bold, is more easily found, and more amply and perfectly expressed, in the works of other theologians. Semler, notwithstanding all his unwearied diligence in theological pursuits, and his great influence upon the opinions of the last half century, and his being worthy on these accounts to be held in continual and grate-

ful remembrance by posterity, is in great danger of being wholly forgotten by the next generation, and of being robbed of what is peculiarly his own, from its circulating under other names. Such is the high-prized immortality of a name !

This sad destiny, which threatens the great name of Semler, it is not perhaps in my power to avert: yet still I venture to write something concerning him. If it be read only by few, and by these few soon be forgotten, still I shall enjoy the consciousness of having offered a tribute due to his memory. And should the account of this great reformer of theology fall into the hands of a generous youth, it may perhaps kindle the sparks of his noble spirit to such a flame, as shall give new light and warmth to future theologians.

He has written his own life to the time when his greater activity commenced, with true fidelity. It explains however but imperfectly the sources of his literary character.

In consequence of a country education in the house of his father, an ecclesiastic of very limited pecuniary circumstances, in his native town, Saalfeld, he was accustomed to a simple mode of life, and to what is of the first necessity to speculative scholars, temperance. His wishes kept within moderate bounds during the whole period of his life, and he was never occupied in those extravagant projects, which lead only to dissatisfaction with one's self and situation, and interrupt those bold literary undertakings, which without natural cheerfulness cannot be prosecuted with success. The curiosity, with which nature had richly endowed him, was in his early years directed to the ancient classics. The most common of these were at that time almost the only books, to be found in the small library of an ecclesiastic, and in a town where there was no public collection; for it was not then as now, that all classes in the cultivated parts of Germany were readers, and that the book-stores were filled with innumerable journals. The study of the classics led him to a manly course of reading, and thence to a right estimate of what was worth acquiring; to which the effeminate scholars of our times can never conduct a youth. But it may be questioned whether from an extreme love of reading he did not read too much, without choice and direc-

tion, and without ascertaining whether the ancient author were adapted to his age. Thus passed his school-years in reading without a director in his course; by which indeed he acquired dexterity in catching the general meaning of a writer, but was not accustomed to exactness of interpretation, to laborious examination of readings, and to that nice judgment, concerning the beauties and defects in ancient authors, necessary for the forming of his taste. The dexterity, that I have mentioned, in which he left scholars of his standing far behind him, and which could not be observed without praise, did not supersede the necessity of skilful direction, to enable him to obtain these other qualifications; but his ambition was not directed to these objects. He thought facility and expedition in expressing his thoughts by writing, a greater perfection, than industrious care to place them methodically, and to express them with exactness and propriety. After pursuing his literary labors in conformity to this opinion, he fixed a habit, which became a second nature, and was so interwoven with his whole being, that it remained to the end of his life a distinguished part of his literary character.

Before he left school, he was in danger of being wholly disordered and impaired in his spirit and intellect. The principal persons of his native town were seized with a religious phrenzy. His father, who had great simplicity of character, withstood this malady till he was overpowered by the extremity of his situation. The son withstood it still longer; for one of his quick and penetrating mind was no subject for the infection. But at length compelled by respect for his father, he also fell into the same disorder.

In this state he went to the Orphan-house* at Halle, where

* [This Orphan-house was an institution, which had for its immediate object, the maintenance and education of orphans, of both sexes; but its advantages were extended to many others. It is commonly called the Orphan-house of Halle, but it is in Glauche, a town adjoining the city. It was founded in 1694, by Professor Augustus Herman Franke, and was one of the most useful and noble establishments in the Prussian dominions. It was formerly much celebrated, and was resorted to from all parts of Europe. Several schools, and two charitable institutions, a nunnery and an almshouse for widows, were connected with it. The whole was under the

he might have easily become incurable; for the air was so epidemic, that as in his own case, even sound spirits suddenly became diseased. Still nature had imparted to him something that strongly opposed this evil; and its power was strengthened at this time by his old friends, the Grecian and Roman authors. By accident he met with some of them, which he had never read, and with certain critical and philological works, which were new to him; his insatiable thirst for reading returned again, and prevented him from devoting so much of his time as he had heretofore done to religious concerns. His good fortune conducted him to the universally celebrated school of Baumgarten; whose dry theology, with its cold and chilling subtleties, counteracted the heat that had been generated in the soul of Semler, and he recovered.

When the disease after a few years wholly disappeared, the energy of his mind seemed in no degree to be impaired, but this period rather served for a time of rest, and the acquisition of new strength, by which he pressed forward with increased vigor. Baumgarten was the great pattern whom Semler boldly emulated, and the former was the tutelar genius of his scholar whom he never abandoned during his life. He took him into his own house for a companion, guided and directed him by his counsel and conduct, by his conversation and example, in his private and public studies, and through all the labyrinths of theology. He gave him free access to his great and valuable library, and Semler, with his insatiable thirst for reading, revelled at the literary table so richly furnished.

From this time he was as full of literary undertakings, as he had been before, during the time when he was in want of books, of literary projects, which often engrossed his whole soul. He formed the gigantic design of uniting in one whole, all the Greek scholia and Lexicons, the etymological works, Hesychius, Suidas, &c. He began with zeal to bring them to-

jurisdiction of the University at Halle. Such was formerly the state of the Orphan-house; what its present condition is, the situation of Europe renders doubtful. The University at Halle was founded in 1694, by Frederick the first, Elector of Saxony, being formed from a military school, and has since been in high repute. *Ed.*]

gether; but had not proceeded through the first letter of the alphabet before he trembled at the vastness of his design, and laid it aside as impracticable. But he derived no small advantages from his plan, which had contributed to extend his knowledge, by the preparatory means he was obliged to provide for executing such a labor. Since he now found so rich a library open to his curiosity, he entered upon the examination of a great variety of subjects. If he heard of any literary undertaking of any of the scholars at Halle, he immediately collected from Baumgarten's library whatever could be of service in the work, and surprised the writer with his contributions so laboriously acquired, and so promptly bestowed; for he was convinced that this was the best method of recommending himself to others.

This activity, which excited great hopes concerning him, early procured him a place among the authors of our country; first through Baumgarten, who brought his darling disciple before the public, and afterwards through the celebrated Schwartz, at Altdorff. Both resigned to him their smaller literary engagements, particularly the correcting of the *Universal History*, which, because it then circulated under the name of Baumgarten, a name every where honored, quickly brought Semler into notice. This gave him an opportunity to bring his *Miscellaneæ Lectiones*—plain critical remarks upon the ancient classics—to Nuremburg for publication, and opened the way to a professorship, at no distant time, in the university at Altdorff. Guided by the patrons already mentioned, at the end of his course at the university, he engaged in labors the most various in their kinds almost at the same time. Between 1748 and 1749 he published a letter to Heumann concerning his unsuccessful emendations of Livy; a treatise upon the correspondence of romances with the legends; an essay towards the correcting of faults in the German *Bayley*; and a translation of the Isis and Osiris of Plutarch. He wrote at the same time a treatise upon the Egyptian dynasties, according to Manetho, Eratosthenes and Gregorius Syncellus, which afterward appeared in the *Universal History*; and several pieces in Latin, which were printed—*In Symbolis Litterariis Bremensibus*, *Miscellaneis Lipsiensibus*—*Actis Societatis Latine Jencn-*

sis; he added, without being called upon, critical remarks to a German edition of the Livonian Chronicle; he collected out of Martene, Durand, and Petz, materials concerning the history of *Lent*; and completed for a German edition of the Symbolic book of the Lutheran church, a collation of the old editions, in company with the inspector of the seminary. In fine, he engaged in a dispute with Whiston.

With so many proofs of his literary diligence, with such richness of historical and philological and literary knowledge, and with a name that authorized the greatest expectations, Semler concluded his year at the university. And what was remarkable in his writings at this period, his whole character as an author was exhibited in all its particulars, except in that enlightened and independent manner of thinking in theology, which characterized him afterward. He manifests in these works of his youth, if one survey them attentively, a genius pressing forward with haste, and checked by no obstacles; which, if possible, would grasp every species of learning; the qualities of a rash author, who, patient and diligent to an extreme, yet not sufficiently methodical, does not thoroughly investigate any one fixed object; who, unconcerned about minute things, would take a vast and comprehensive view of the whole, and grasp and pursue ideas too great for common minds, regardless of the hatred and envy of the *mob* of scholars. He seems to have ranged in haste through the whole field of literature, to have collected here and there whatever he met with, which was excellent and to his purpose, without any particular and painful exertion. He knew where to find treasures, which no one suspected, without very diligent search; for he had taken such a general view of literary ground, that he knew where the richest metals lay. He was one, of whom others would gladly learn, according to what rules he discovered the precious veins of pure gold. He already evinced an uncommon richness of thought, a quick perception of truth, and a rare talent for new discoveries: but on the other hand, he betrayed the marks of a disposition to hasty criticism, from which, without a total change in his literary character, nothing could be expected but imperfect productions; and shewed a mind of such a cast, that

it might indeed be supposed, he would break many new paths, but would make none smooth and pleasant; that he would strike out many happy thoughts, but would rarely present any one sufficiently clear, definite, and correct. In short, the school from which he came, and the unlimited admiration of Baumgarten's erudition, promised to make him a very *learned* theologian, but not a very enlightened one.

According to our present conceptions of an enlightened theologian, it does not appear either that Halle was the proper university, or that Baumgarten was the most suitable instructor for the formation of such a character. Halle was the seat of a religious phrenzy, where all theological literature, founded in philology, history, and philosophy, was publicly condemned; and if Baumgarten had preserved himself from these prepossessions, still he did not possess that extensive learning, which is necessary to form an enlightened and complete theologian. He attempted by means of history and philosophy to throw light upon theological subjects; but wholly neglecting philology and criticism, and unacquainted with the best sources of knowledge, he was unable to free religion from its corruptions. Every thing that the church taught passed with him for infallible truth. He did not take pains to inquire whether it agreed with scripture or common sense. Devoted to the church, he assumed its doctrines, and fortified its traditions with the shew of demonstrations, as with insurmountable walls of defence. His scholars were no less prompt and positive in their decisions than their instructor. Every dogma of their teacher was received by them as if it were a mathematical certainty, and his polemics exhibited to them the Lutheran church in exclusive possession of the truth, and resigned all other sects, covered with shame and contempt, to their respective errors. Every thing appeared to be so clearly exhibited and proved by him, that there seemed to be nothing left for future scholars to investigate and explain; but only to repeat and enforce in an intelligible manner the truths already acquired. Baumgarten, indeed, accounted it nothing less than high treason against his discipline, for his scholars to presume to think and examine for themselves; and acknowledged him as

ly for his genuine disciple, who left his school confident, that with the weapons of his instructor in his hands, he could resist the whole theological world, and overcome it without a violent struggle. He who is so positive in his instructions, and requires such implicit faith in his pupils, is not himself wise and enlightened, and is still less deserving to be considered an apostle of light and wisdom.

But even the great reverence in which Semler held the name of Baumgarten was not sufficient to engage his quick and sanguine mind to very close attention to the lectures of his preceptor. Baumgarten's demonstrations were not congenial with his mind; and it is manifest from his first writings, that he possessed a more limited knowledge of theology, than a course attended with constant diligence under Baumgarten's instruction, must have given him. While he lived with Baumgarten as his companion, he employed himself much in private reading, and in the study of the ancient classics, which inspired him with their free spirit, and accustomed him to thinking. But now he entered upon a situation where he was compelled to exert himself as a theologian.

At first however fortune seemed to destine him, not for a theologian, but for a political writer in a gazette. This office he undertook at Coburg in the year 1750, soon after his departure from the university of Halle, together with that of nominal professor at the academical *Gymnasium* in that place. It appeared indeed that fortune assigned him this interim to bring him acquainted with a woman, who should correct his instability and become in a manner his guardian; since he was almost altogether wanting in expedients to order and manage with advantage the smallest things pertaining to active life. After due preparatory means he hastened to a higher destination.

It was through history that his path was directed as a literary reformer. Before he commenced this character the professorship of this branch of study at Altdorff was offered him, in 1751. This so firmly fixed his inclinations for history that he took her as a friend to his theological station at Halle, and retained his predilection for her through his whole life. In his subsequent recollections

Altdorff was considered by him as his earthly paradise, and the year that he spent there as the most fortunate, and the most rich in pure enjoyment of any period of his life. It was the first year of marriage, which no domestic affliction imbibtered; it was the first year of his life as professor at a university, which (to its praise be it said) strove to make the honor, that the college, the town, and the university had gained, pleasant and agreeable to Semler, by marks of attention and friendship; and it was a time of his life, when as yet he was formidable to no rival.

Unacquainted with the difficulties of a professor's situation, and dreaming of continually increasing felicity in his office, he entered upon his new and greater duties at Halle, and found himself cruelly deceived. Overwhelmed with unpleasant circumstances at his arrival, he was in danger of losing all firmness; but the steady and masculine spirit of his wife came to his aid, and upheld him when he began to falter. Without her succour, he would have fallen a victim to the clamors and cabals incident to his office. It were to be wished that this noble woman could have rendered him the same service through the whole of his life, and have preserved him from the insults and mockeries heaped on him by his contemporaries, and which posterity may repeat.

The first year of his life as professor at Halle was difficult and perplexing, because he really had not become qualified for the office. Still he was fitted to become in a short time better and more perfectly qualified than any other man; for he was excellently grounded in that general learning, which is necessary to the divine. Of his imperfections no one was more aware than himself: the more industriously therefore did he exert all his powers, and in a few years he became familiarly acquainted with every branch of theology.

He had passed a whole year at Altdorff in the study of civil and literary history; and Baumgarten assigned to him on his arrival at the university of Halle the historical part of theological instruction in preference to any other, because he had made the greatest advances in its cultivation. From this circumstance his theological studies assumed almost exclusively an his-

torical direction; and he was in the sequel indebted to this for almost every thing. History freed him from his theological prejudices, gave him his first correct views in criticism, and in dogmatic and polemic divinity. With her torch she accustomed his eyes to the light, and continually made his way more visible. The mode of interpretation of the sacred scriptures which he learnt by fragments of heretical history, pleased him, and accorded more than all the traditions of the church, with his native love of probability. He found the criticism of the orthodox fathers of the church often false, and less deserving of credit, than that of the heretical critics, who are so bitterly aspersed. In the origin of the orthodox system, as far as he could trace it from history, he found so much merely human, that his belief in the infallible correctness of the scholars now in full reputation, was at length shaken.

During the first year of his office as professor at Halle, he was rich in peculiar discoveries, that gave him an opportunity for bold suggestions; but still he was compelled to restrain himself, for he was very narrowly watched. Baumgarten, who had early discovered Semler's independence of character, observed all his conversation, and exhorted him continually not to become an apostate from his school. Semler accordingly restrained himself till the death of his preceptor, in the year 1757. Now he advanced more boldly, and declared his sentiments with less reserve. He was now free from the vigilance of his teacher, and instead of being overshadowed by his great name, he occupied his place. With Baumgarten's posthumous works, which he accompanied with introductions full of learning and information, his name was soon brought into public notice. His reputation every year increased, and with his reputation his independence; so that he ventured at length (confiding in the freedom of the press, and the freedom of thought, which his great sovereign appeared to favor, that he might extend universal toleration within his dominions) to appear openly with his free declarations upon theological subjects, and to make the public acquainted with his opinions. About the year 1760 he became known in that character, which he afterward sustained for twenty years; not barely as the most learned and

best informed theologian, but also as the most enlightened, and the best qualified to enlighten others.

Semler commenced, where every reformer in theology must begin—with a critical study of the bible. For this kind of study, however, the school, in which he had been taught, had little prepared him. Baumgarten could not form his scholars to become good critics, because he was not one himself, and had no just conceptions of the duties pertaining to such a character. He wrote, however, a treatise in German upon criticism, with the unlimited approbation of his contemporaries, and was very full of his theories concerning it. But there is a wide difference between theory and practice: beside, Baumgarten advanced not a single step beyond the most common and obvious principles of criticism; accommodated only to the most ordinary subjects of explication. Theory, likewise, is in itself so far from forming good interpreters, that according to history, the feeblest expounders of scripture have ever been found in the times, when greater value was attributed to the study of the general principles of interpretation, than to their practical application. But practice leads to general rules, and forms better and more solid critics.

Semler at first followed the prevailing taste of his time, and commenced his exegetical course, with lectures upon Baumgarten's method of explaining scripture. The general rules of interpretation in his book of instruction, afforded Semler at first so much opportunity for illustration, that he was very well satisfied with himself and his guide; but his fortunate genius and his acquaintance with ancient literature, soon gave him occasion to remark the insufficiency and defects of his author. He soon recollected the peculiar modes of explaining the ancient classics, and was now in a way to discover, that, as for every classic, so also for the New Testament, a special mode of interpretation was necessary. He came to his task with a sincere desire to make the authors of the scriptures well understood; and to this end he found his classical knowledge extremely serviceable. He found what had heretofore been allowed by no biblical critics, that all except historical interpretations are liable to throw false light upon an ancient author. By his single exertions he

advanced his ideas of criticism to a system; which indeed he has no where scientifically exhibited, but which he has amply employed in his paraphrases.*

Semler was better acquainted with the languages, in which the scriptures are written, than is common with theologians. The Greek he had thoroughly acquired by extensive reading, and the Hebrew was so familiar to him that he could at once detect the Hebraisms in the New Testament, and explain them by his knowledge of those two languages. He did not however indulge himself in minute grammatical analyses, and subtle investigations of single texts; but he adopted that meaning of single words and of whole sentences, which, considering all circumstances of construction, and the dependence of the words or sentences, appeared the most probable. He seized upon that sense of the author, which, from his familiar knowledge of the language, presented itself to him at first sight, without asking himself whether a different sense were possible, and whether this possible sense should be alighted. He found a more pleasant and better method of grammatical explication than that which was in use, in looking for the true connexion of the words, a more correct punctuation, or a more fortunate arrangement of the sentence. For all this he was qualified by a happy genius, a distinguishing mind, and a quick perception of probability in respect to interpretations, acquired by early practice. He did not therefore give himself the trouble to prove any of his interpretations methodically, or by long, minute, grammatical criticisms, and to draw them out in their technical form, which indeed might have been wished for such readers, as could not themselves find out the grammatical proofs for his new explanations. He knew how to look into the spirit and sense of an ancient writer with deep penetration; and from a happy talent, he was fruitful in resources, without long and tedious investigation. But he was destitute of patience for the laborious examination of words and syllables. It was necessary therefore that he should have some person at hand, who should

* Instances occur, scattered here and there in his *Apparatus ad liberalem N. T. interpretationem* 1767-8; in his *Hermeneutischen Vorbereitungen*, &c.

weigh with minute diligence, what his genius had produced in a moment, scan it with the subtilty of a grammarian, prove it methodically, and here and there correct it. Thus he knew how to produce light, but not to proportion it to the weak vision of ordinary scholars.

His talents accommodated to what was great, and his rapid manner of using the ancient classics, weaned him from a love of exact interpretation, and attached him to the paraphrastic mode of explanation. In paraphrase he laid aside his researches as an expositor, agreeably to the fashion of theology for thirty years before; although by this means he thought he should poorly succeed. He came to his task without preparation; but the performance of it required, in order to due uniformity, a peculiar theory respecting it, which no paraphrast had given; or a long practice in the art to bring it to perfection, which might supply the place of a good theory; or a suitable model, by the study of which one might accustom himself to its manner, and acquire some conception of it, that should lead to certain fixed rules, without considering however those rules as always definite and certain: such a model however was wholly wanting. But it is difficult to give to a paraphrase a uniform and equal manner, if one wish to express every thing clearly and intelligibly. Striving for clearness one easily falls into a loquacious and prolix manner; endeavouring to exhaust the ideas of an author leads as easily to the interpolation of sentiments wholly foreign; and a free mode of interpretation is as natural a cause of inattention to the ideas of the original. What wonder if Semler's paraphrases, from the total want of necessary preparation, modeled upon no similar productions, were very full of those faults, into which paraphrasts are liable to fall.*

* His paraphrases appeared in the following order:

Paraphrasis Epistolæ ad Romanos; cum notis, translatione vetusta cet. 1769, 8vo. Paraphrasis in primam Pauli ad Corinthios epistolam 1770. Paraphr. epist. secundæ 1776, 8vo. Paraphrasis Evangelii Joannis P. I. II. 1771, 1772, 8vo. Paraphrasis Epistolæ ad Galatas, 1779, 8vo. Paraphrasis Epistolæ Jacobi, 1781, 8vo. Paraphrasis in Epistolam 1 Petri. Halæ, 1783, 8vo. Epist. 2 Petri et Judæ. Halæ, 1784. Paraphrasis in primam Joannia epistolam. Rigæ, 1792, 8vo. [These paraphrases have, within the last year, been added to the library of the university in this place. *Ed.*]

In general however they rightly express the sense of the paraphrased texts, and often very clearly; but they follow no uniform method: here they express the sense in few, and there in many words; and in the last case, in a manner not always sufficiently clear and definite. In general however they keep to the text with sufficient fidelity. But thoughts are sometimes arbitrarily interpolated, which have no foundation in the words that are intended to be paraphrased. Sometimes tropical expressions and Hebraisms are happily couched in a style of pure latinity; but this at another time is wholly neglected.

It was unfortunate that Semler chose the Latin language, in which still less than in German, he knew how to express himself with elegance and purity: how could he then succeed? Even Erasmus, who wrote with such ease and correctness in the Latin language, in many places fell far short of the excellence, which should characterise paraphrase: and how much more must this have been the case with Semler?

But for the deficiencies of his paraphrases, Semler made ample amends, by the ideas and reflections of his own, which he connected with them, and which he made the vehicle of reformation in criticism, in exposition, and in dogmatical theology. The copious notes to his paraphrases contain such a treasure of philological, antiquarian, critical, and dogmatical remarks, results, and hints, that they richly compensate the student for the pains of an exact and diligent examination of them. To the helps, which were at hand, upon the books that he paraphrased, he never gave very particular attention. He selected out of certain church fathers* of the sixteenth century, to which he occasionally had recourse, a few grammatical remarks, and consulted Wolf, Bengel, and Heumann, accompanying what he selected from them with his own criticisms. But he wanted the best helps, which we now possess for a critical explanation of the New Testament, and was indeed in some respects even behind his contemporaries. Yet he exercised his genius, his spirit of observation, and his extensive learning, to greater purposes than ordinary critics have in view, and was led to discov-

* Of the Lutheran church.

eries and results, to which the most diligent compiler would never arrive. The verbal criticisms in his notes are few; but for the most part peculiar to himself and worthy of being attentively weighed. His critical remarks of another kind are numerous and important. In places where the interpretation depends somewhat upon the reading adopted, the variations are often exhibited from versions, from the works of the Latin and Greek fathers, and from conjectures on the writing of manuscripts with more exactness and perfection than in the works of Mill, Bengel, and Wetstein, whose collections one may increase out of Semler. There are likewise to be found in his notes such remarks, as shew how one may pursue this sort of criticism in his own study without the help of a library richly stored with manuscripts. Since he produced a new system of criticism upon the New Testament, more fixed and well grounded than his predecessors possessed, his decisions upon various readings must be of great value. In an appendix to every paraphrase is contained the old Latin version of the paraphrased book, printed with variations from MSS. and the Fathers, because Semler wished, for the benefit of criticism and dogmatical theology, to see them in more general circulation: and to this end the addition might be of much service; but it attached a mass of matter to his paraphrases, which did not belong to them.

(To be continued.)

To the Editor of the "General Repository and Review."

SIR,

I HAVE, in MS. a work entitled "The Morning Inquiry," which is written in Numbers. A friend has requested that the first No. may appear in your work. To this I have consented. But I wish it to be understood that I have no *party* interest to promote, and no desire to degrade any denomination of professing Christians. The detection of error and the display of truth must tend to the advantage of all sects of Christians. Your name, your character, and your theological opinions are wholly unknown to me. But as, on the plan you have adopted, you consider yourself as *not* "responsible for the particular opinions," which may appear in your Repository, so you will doubtless consider the writers as not responsible for yours. Whatever you may receive from me will, I hope, be found free

from the spirit of reviling, yet written with that independence of mind, which becomes one who expects to give account of *himself* unto God.

H. R.

AN IMPORTANT QUESTION EXAMINED.

"For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for the battle. So likewise ye, except ye utter words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye shall speak into the air.—

"If I know not the *meaning* of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me."

St. Paul

.....

QUESTION:—*Can it be properly said that a person believes the truth affirmed by a proposition, the terms of which he does not understand?*

In every proposition there are certain words on which the meaning essentially depends. The import of these terms must be understood or we cannot understand what is affirmed.

Example. The *Square Root* of one hundred is ten. I may have a clear idea of the import of the terms *one hundred*, and the term *ten*; but still I shall be ignorant of the truth affirmed unless I know the meaning of the words *Square Root*. Can I, then, believe in the truth of the proposition while I am ignorant of what is affirmed?

Answer. If the proposition be stated by a scholar on whose veracity I rely, I may believe that he *speaks the truth*, although I am ignorant of the truth he affirms. But it is one thing to believe that what is *stated is true*, and another to believe in the *truth itself*. I may have such confidence in the knowledge and veracity of another person, as to believe that he speaks the truth, while I know not the meaning of one word he uses. He may affirm something in a foreign language, with which I have no acquaintance, and I may verily believe that his declaration is true, while I am perfectly ignorant of the truth he affirms. But to believe in the truth affirmed we must have a *perception* of that truth. This, however, cannot be had prior to a knowledge of the *meaning* of the terms adopted.

As words are often ambiguous, we must not only know *some meaning* to the several terms used, but we must know the

particular sense of the words in the given proposition, or its meaning will not be understood.

Example. There are three *minutes* in one *league*.

Here we have two principal words, both of which are ambiguous, viz. *minutes* and *league*. The term *minutes* is used to denote the records of a court; sketches or memorandums of events, transactions or discourses; the sixtieth parts of an hour, and the sixtieth parts of a degree. The term *league* is used for a *contract* between two or more persons; it also denotes a measure of three miles, or the twentieth part of a degree.

To understand the proposition last stated, we must know the *particular sense* of its terms. For if we mistake the meaning of either of the principal words, we necessarily mistake the *sense* of the proposition.

Suppose the words to be used by a man of known information and veracity in a company of unlearned men; from confidence in the speaker they might all believe that his affirmation contained a truth. But in how many different senses might his language be understood, by attaching different ideas to the terms he used.

One acquainted with geography takes the true idea, that a league is a measure of three miles.

Another by *minutes* understands *time*, and thinks that a league is such a distance as requires three minutes in sailing or running.

A third, by *league* understands a *contract*, and by *minutes* *written particulars* of a transaction. He supposes that the speaker affirmed that in a certain contract three distinct particulars were implied.

A fourth, by *league* understands *contract*, and by *minutes* *time*: he takes the idea of a contract which required three minutes for writing, or which was to be binding on the parties only for the space of three minutes.

A fifth, by *league* understands a *contract*, and by three *minutes* so many *miles*. Of course he forms the idea of an enormous contract three miles in length.

Others of the company might form ideas different from any of these, and others still might have no definite idea commu-

nicated to their minds. Thus a company of a hundred persons, from confidence in the speaker, might believe his declaration to be true, while but one believes in the truth affirmed. All who mistake the *meaning* of the terms, mistake the import of the proposition; and while they believe it to be true, their real belief is according to their mistaken views of the terms.

From confidence in the scriptures as the oracles of God, a person may believe that every proposition in the Bible is true, and yet he may be ignorant of nine tenths of the truths affirmed in that sacred book.

Several persons may agree in a belief that a certain Bible proposition is true, and yet each one may have a different opinion from any of the others as to the meaning of the text.

Example. "Thou art the CHRIST the SON of the LIVING GOD."

Christians of every denomination believe that this proposition is true; and true in the sense in which Peter used the terms. They, also, agree in the belief that Jesus was the Christ or promised Messiah. Thus far they unitedly believe not only that the proposition is true, but in the truth affirmed. They moreover agree that there is truth in the affirmation that Christ is the SON of the LIVING GOD. But, still, how various is their belief in respect to the sense in which *he* is the Son of God, or the ground on which he is so called.

One affirms that Christ is one of *three persons* in the *one God*, and eternally begotten.

A second, that he is one of three persons in the one God, and called a son on account of his Mediatorial office.

A third, that he is one of the three persons, and called a son on the ground of his becoming incarnate.

A fourth, that he is one of the three persons, and called a son because his human nature was "created by an immediate act."

A fifth, that he is one of the three persons, and that the man united to him was called the Son of God as saints are sons of God.

A sixth, supposes him to be a *super-angelic creature*, and as such called the Son of God.

A seventh, supposes him to be a mere man, extraordinarily endowed, and thus called the Son of God.

An eighth, supposes him to be a *human being* who had pre-existence, and was in a peculiar manner united to the one God, the Father, so that in him dwelt all the fulness of the God-head; and, therefore, called the Son of God.

A ninth, supposes that he was truly a *man*, who had no pre-existence, but was united to the Deity as intimately as our souls are united to our bodies; and that he is called the Son of God on the ground of the miraculous conception.

A tenth, supposes him to be *truly* and *properly* the SON of the LIVING GOD; that he derived his existence from Deity as a *son* from a *father* before any creature was formed; and that he became man by a miraculous union to a human body.

Although all Christians may believe that Peter's proposition is true, in affirming that Jesus Christ is, in some sense or other, the Son of God, yet no one can believe that it is true in all these various senses. The *last* accords with the natural import of this language used respecting him, "*own Son*," *only begotten Son of God*, &c. And if this be the true sense, those who believe him to be the Son of God in either of the other senses, do not believe the truth affirmed by Peter. But by mistaking the meaning of his words, "the Son of the living God," they mistake the import of his confession, and believe in error;—as really so, as the man did who believed in the existence of a contract three miles long on hearing it said that there are three minutes in one league.

Hence we infer that a man's professing to believe that a proposition is true, is no certain evidence that he believes the truth thus affirmed. To be satisfied that a man believes the truth contained in any article of faith we must be satisfied that he understands the terms. If it be evident that he does not know the meaning of the words, it will, also, be evident that he does not know the *sense* of the proposition.

We may, also, observe, that a proposition may be strictly true, and a man may firmly believe it to be true, and yet by mistaking the terms, his sentiment or faith may be perfectly erroneous. A creed, or confession of faith, may be perfectly

correct; a man may adopt and subscribe it believing it to be true; and yet his real opinions may be perfectly inconsistent with the opinions expressed in the articles he subscribed. A number of persons may unite in adopting the same articles of faith while they are really opposed to each other in sentiment.

In the light of the preceding observations, let us now candidly examine another proposition, and the faith of its advocates.

Proposition. "There are three distinct persons in one God."

This is viewed, by many, as an article of the first importance in theology; it therefore demands a careful and thorough examination. And as it is not in the Bible we may safely criticise on its import, as we would on any other proposition invented by man. It is with *this*, as with all others, to believe what is affirmed, we must first understand the terms. Without this, we know not what is affirmed, nor what is believed by those who say that the proposition is an article of their faith. And if they do not understand the terms, how do they know what they believe?

Had the proposition been expressed in a foreign language with which we have no acquaintance, should we not have needed a distinct explanation of the words? Would it have been consistent to adopt the proposition as an article of faith prior to knowing the *meaning* of its terms? It is indeed expressed in our own language, and in terms which are common and familiar, yet if we do not know the *sense* in which they are here used, we do not know what is affirmed.

The terms are used according to their natural import and common acceptation, or they are not. If they *are*, the proposition contains the same absurdity as saying there are *three distinct persons in one King*. For the term *God* in its common acceptation as really means *one person* as the term *King*. And by three distinct persons we usually mean three *distinct beings*, as really as when we say *three distinct men*. Therefore, according to the common acceptation of language the proposition is of this import viz. there are three *distinct beings in one being*,

or three *distinct persons* in *one person*, or three *distinct Gods* in *one God*.

But as the advocates for the proposition disavow these ideas, must they not admit that they use the terms in a sense foreign from their common signification? And when terms which are common and familiar are used in a sense foreign from their natural import do they not require as distinct explanation as words of a foreign language? And until this explanation be given, is not the meaning of the proposition a matter of mere *conjecture*? Yea, and are not people in more danger of being misled by common and familiar terms when used in an uncommon or unnatural sense, than by words with which they have had no acquaintance? Will not the familiar sense of the words always first arise in the mind on sight of the proposition, and remain as the sense intended until the person be better informed by some explanation?

If the terms *one God* are used in a sense analogous to *one Council* or *one Triumvirate*, then they must be understood in order to obtain the sense of the proposition. But if by *one God* be meant one *intelligent Being*, so the terms must be understood or the meaning will not be apprehended.

If by three distinct persons be meant three *proper persons* or beings we must so understand them. But if by three persons be meant only *allegorical persons*, as three *modes*, or three *attributes*, or three *offices* personified, the terms must be so explained and understood or the meaning of the proposition will not be perceived.

As an article of faith, it has been explained in more different ways than there are words in the sentence. By some modern trinitarians,* it has been explained to mean three *dis-*

* Those who believe that the *one God* is *three persons* appropriate to themselves the name *Trinitarians*. Therefore the term is here used in that sense. But the writer wishes it to be understood that he does not deny the scripture doctrine of the *Father*, the *Son*, and the *Holy Spirit*. He, however, believes the doctrine, that God is three persons, does really imply a *denial* of the *Father*, the *Son*, and the *Holy Spirit* in the scripture sense of those terms. Before the Messiah appeared in the flesh God said thus, "I have put my spirit upon him." Isa. xlii. 1. This was prophecy, and when the Messiah was inducted into office, God proclaimed, "this is my

tinct agents in one *Being*. But in every other case the terms *three distinct agents* mean *three distinct beings*. These expositors have, therefore, yet to explain what *they* mean by *distinct agents* in contradistinction to *distinct beings*. And until this be done we cannot tell what they mean by the proposition, or whether they mean any thing which can be understood.

It is suspected that the most numerous class of divines have meant *one proper person*, and *two allegorical persons*, or the *wisdom* and *energy* of God personified for the Son and Holy Spirit.

Another class have supposed that by the three persons no more is intended than the *power*, *wisdom*, and *love* of Deity personified.

A fourth class, by three distinct persons have meant *three distinct offices*.

A fifth class by three persons mean the same as *three beings* some how so united as to be one God. And this, it is suspected, is the most common idea among the unlearned who have affixed any meaning to the terms. But some divines as well as many other people use the form of words without any definite meaning, and do not profess to know what is intended, or *ought* to be intended, by them.

All these various classes profess to believe that the proposition contains a truth of the first importance. But are we to suppose that it is true in all the various senses in which it has been explained? This no person of discernment will pretend. In *what sense*, then, *is it true*? If it be true in any *one sense*, and in *but one*, of what value is the faith of those who believe it to be true in any other sense? They are so far from believing the truth affirmed that they believe in error, as really as those by whom the article is totally rejected. With sufficient self-

"beloved son in whom I am well pleased;" at the same time "the *spirit* of God descended and abode upon him." John says, "I saw and bare record that this is the Son of God."—He also said, "God giveth the Spirit not by measure unto him." Thus "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the HOLY SPIRIT and with power." Such is the scriptural account of the *Father*, the *Son*, and the *Holy Spirit*. But in all this account, the Father is the ONE GOD, Jesus is *his Son*, and the *Holy Spirit* is that with which God anointed and endued the Son in whom he was well pleased.

complacency, and not a little censoriousness; has it not been pretended that the doctrine of three distinct persons in one God has been believed by all the true church of Christ from the days of the apostles to the present time? But after all, it may be asked, how far have trinitarians themselves been united in their belief? And what has been the amount of their faith? Can it be said that they have been agreed as to the *meaning* of this article of their faith? Certainly not: for it is well known that from generation to generation, divines have, in this respect, been much divided in opinion. Has not their agreement consisted merely in admitting a *form of words*, as an article of faith, which the best divines have explained in many different senses? If merely agreeing in a form of words implies union of sentiment, we may affirm that all professed Christians have been united in opinion respecting the character of Christ. For all have admitted the proposition that he is "the Christ the Son of the living God." Yet we have seen a great variety of opinions respecting this article of faith; and about the same variety among trinitarians themselves respecting the import of their favorite article—"There are three distinct persons in one God."

Let any one fix on either of the explanations which have been given, and then inquire, whether there be any evidence that a majority, even of trinitarians, have believed the proposition in that particular sense. Let us farther inquire, whether there be not reason to suppose that nine tenths of those who have admitted the article, have done this, affixing to the words no definite meaning, or one which implies three distinct Beings? And whether it be not a fact that ninety nine out of a hundred, have admitted the form of words on the authority of others, without any careful examination respecting their import?

I do not, indeed, admit this combination of words as a correct expression of any Bible truth. But excepting this single circumstance I am, perhaps, as much of a trinitarian as one half the persons who have adopted the article. I believe in the *three attributes* of God, *power, wisdom, and love*. And this is all that some trinitarian divines have meant by the three persons in one God.

I believe that God acts in three distinct offices, as Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier. This is what others have meant by three persons.

I, also, believe in God, as one proper person or intelligent Being; and in his wisdom and energy; and that these may be sometimes personified. This, it is supposed, was the trinity of Origen, of Calvin, and of Baxter and their numerous, genuine followers. Why, then, am I not as really a trinitarian, as the several classes whose sentiments have now been represented? These several classes, it is believed, comprize much the greater part of all the trinitarian divines who have lived since the year A. D. 381, when the doctrine in question received its "finishing touch." Why then may I not have *some* share in the *renown* attached to trinitarian orthodoxy?

It may here be proper to inquire, what virtue or praiseworthiness can there be in believing a proposition to be true, while its meaning is *unknown*? If I have evidence that the affirmation was made by God, or one inspired by him, my believing it to be true, while its meaning is unknown, may be evidence of my confidence in the wisdom and veracity of Jehovah. But I may not thus call any *man*, Father. When men state what they believe, in a form of words not found in the scriptures, we have a right to ask what they *mean*. And if they have any definite meaning they can make it known. If they say they know not the meaning of their own terms, we may safely say, they know not what they affirm.⁴ If they cannot tell their *own meaning*, how can they reasonably expect others to adopt their proposition as an article of faith? But if the writer of a proposition has a definite meaning to his words, and that meaning be the truth, yet if another adopt it with a different meaning, he in fact embraces error instead of truth.

It is the opinion of some ministers that it is best to give no explanation of the doctrine of three persons in one God. They say it is a mystery, and no explanation can be reasonably expected. Hence they feel under no obligations to tell what *they mean* by the three distinct persons. Why, then, would it not have been infinitely better to have left the subject just as it stood in the sacred oracles? Does it become men to express as arti-

cles of faith, their own opinions of the import of any passages in the Bible, in language which they themselves cannot explain? If there be passages of scripture which are to us mysterious, would it not be far more wise and safe to let them stand as they are, and wait for farther light, than to pretend to express their import in propositions unintelligible to ourselves and to others?

Moreover, if the passages in the Bible which are supposed to favour the doctrine in question be really mysterious beyond explanation, how does any mortal know that their meaning is expressed in the unintelligible proposition? To know that this expresses the meaning of any passages of scripture, we must first know the meaning of those passages, and then the meaning of the proposition, so as to be able to compare them together. Yet men venture to express what they say is the meaning of scripture in language which they cannot explain. Not only so, they make their own unintelligible form of words an essential article of Christian faith; and that too, while they know not the meaning of their own terms.

To me it appears, that there is no passage of scripture which has respect to the Father, the Son, or the Holy Spirit, which is half so difficult to explain, or half so likely to be misunderstood as the proposition now under examination. Yet this unintelligible combination of words must be considered as so sacred, as to be made a criterion of Christian fellowship. But notwithstanding all the importance which men have attached to this article, and all the confidence with which it has been maintained, it is a serious fact that those who reject it, are no more opposed in sentiment to those who embrace it, than those who admit it are opposed to each other. And is it not, also, a fact, that the greater part of those who have adopted the article, are as ignorant of its real import as a blind man is of the colours of a rainbow? Confiding in the "*tradition of the Elders*," without examination, they have adopted the proposition, either with *no meaning*, or as great a variety of *discordant meanings*, as were supposed in the company of unlearned men who heard it affirmed that there are three minutes in one league.

Is it not much to be lamented that men of eminence in learning and piety, with sentiments *really discordant*, should

contend for a human proposition, which is professedly inexplicable, as though the whole fabric of Christianity were depending on this as its foundation? If it be an error for people to believe a *plurality of self-existent Beings*, who can reasonably doubt that this proposition is of bad tendency, if left unexplained? For who is able to distinguish between *three persons* and *three beings*? And might we not just as safely tell common people that there are *three beings* in *one God*, as *three persons* in *one God*? They know not any difference between a *person* and an *intelligent being*. And where is the divine who will hazard his character so far as to attempt to explain the difference? There may be *some* who will venture to say there is a difference; but I have not known of any one who has attempted to state in what the difference consists. If, then, it be a fact that the terms *three distinct persons* do naturally convey the idea, of *three distinct beings*, and no one explains the difference, it is evident that the proposition has a direct tendency to lead people into the belief that there are three distinct intelligent beings some how united in one God. Does it not, then, seriously behove the advocates for the proposition, either to agree in some intelligible explanation, or to give up the article as *useless* and of *evil tendency*?

The conduct of one sect, in assuming the title of *rational Christians*, has justly been accused by trinitarian writers. But whether some of them have not been equally reprehensible may be worthy of consideration. How much have *they* labored to make the world believe that true piety has been found only among trinitarians? And which is the most evidential of pride, for a sect to arrogate to themselves a *peculiar share of rationality*, or *all the piety* in the Christian world?

For the purpose of self-commendation, or to cast an odium on others, or to deter people from a thorough examination of their sentiments, or for some other purpose not very obvious, some have taken considerable pains to impress the idea that all, or nearly all, who depart from trinitarianism, proceed from bad to worse, until they make shipwreck of the faith once delivered to the saints. And, of course, when any one openly dissents from their creed, they would have the public expect that he will

totally apostatize from the Christian faith. Such representations procure applause to those who can thus *commend themselves*; they excite a jealous, censorious, and clamorous spirit towards such as feel bound to dissent from the popular mystery; and they, also, deter multitudes from any impartial examination of the doctrine in question, or any thing proposed as more scriptural.

It is my wish not to render evil for evil or reviling for reviling; but may I not ask whether a resort to such methods for the support of the trinitarian cause is not beneath the dignity of the clergy of that denomination? Does it not evince *want* of solid argument, and *inattention* to the true *state of facts*? Before such representations are any more urged, it is wished that trinitarian writers would attend a little to the following reasonable inquiries.

In what sense did the bishops of Constantinople understand the terms, three distinct persons in one God? Dr. Mosheim informs us that it was a council in that place which “gave the *finishing touch*” to this doctrine in the year A. D. 381. As it had not received “its finishing touch” till that time, it seems to be a matter of high importance to know what those bishops meant by the terms they used; for the doctrine was then in its primitive purity. Had these bishops any *definite meaning* to their words? or did they *mean every thing* which has since that time been held by trinitarians on the ground of this article? If they had but *one* meaning to their proposition, what was that *one meaning*?

Did they *mean* that God is *three distinct agents*? Some would, probably, be pleased to have this granted. Let this, for the present, be admitted as the true trinitarian doctrine. What then has become of Calvin, of Baxter, and the many thousands who have supposed that the *Son* and *Spirit* are the *wisdom* and *energy* of Deity personified? And what has been the fate of all the other classes of trinitarians who have supposed the three persons to be three *modes*, or three *attributes*, or three *offices* personified? And those also who have so far dissented as to use the terms without *any meaning*? Are all these classes to be considered as apostates, having drawn back unto perdition?

Again, was the original doctrine of three persons in one God no more than Origen's *allegorical Trinity*, improved by the use of the word *person*? There are pretty strong reasons for supposing this to be the fact. If so, Calvin, Baxter, and those who have agreed with them, have been the true trinitarians. And those who have given a different meaning to the proposition have been *dissenters*. What, then, will become of those who hold to three distinct agents in one God? Are they apostates and in the road to perdition? Will not the doom which some have passed on all who dissent from the strict trinitarian doctrine involve themselves among the apostates?

Moreover, it is well known that Doctor Watts departed from the doctrine of three persons in one God in the latter part of his life. And do trinitarians wish to have it believed that Watts is among the damned? and that all his disciples have gone, or are going, to the same place of torment?

Once more. It is desired that those who have been disposed to deal so largely in censure would consider what a number of apostates *might* be reckoned up, who never departed from the trinitarian doctrine, but have, by their *practice*, made shipwreck not only of Christian *faith* but Christian *works*. If an invidious mind should make a full collection of such names, and attribute their apostasy to their having embraced trinitarian sentiments, might not the catalogue bear a comparison with any which has been made out by trinitarian writers. And would it not be treating them as they have been disposed to treat those who have dissented from their opinion? But would it not, at the same time, be rendering evil for evil, and reviling for reviling?

On such ground, it would be very easy to raise a hue and cry against every denomination of long standing. But is it not as *abominable* as it is *easy*? There have been, and are now, many, *very many* amiable characters among the trinitarians; nor do I feel any less respect for them on account of the many bad characters of that denomination. But neither bad nor good characters are exclusively of any one sect of Christians.

But although *some* trinitarians are not altogether so candid towards such as reject their favorite proposition, they are re-

markably liberal towards each other, in respect to the latitude allowed for explanation. With any one of the seven or eight distinct opinions as to the import of the term a man may stand on very fair ground. And a man may be a *very good* and *firm trinitarian*, if he only admit the favorite article, without *any opinion* of its *real import*. The great thing requisite, is, to admit the proposition as true, in some sense or other, either known or unknown.

There is indeed some occasion for this extensive candor in respect to the various explanations; for it must be evident to every person of discernment that the proposition cannot be understood according to the natural import of the terms. Its meaning, therefore, must be a matter of *conjecture*. And every explanation which has yet been given, in a greater or less degree, contradicts the most obvious import of one or other of the terms of the proposition. Most of the explanations perfectly exclude the idea of *three distinct persons*, and represent God as strictly *one person* as he is supposed to be by any unitarian.

But is it not extraordinary that there should be such zeal for a *form of words*, while it is viewed as a matter of such indifference what meaning or whether any meaning be attached to them? What are words but vehicles for the conveyance of truth? Shall then the *form of words* be held so sacred, and the *meaning* of them be of no importance?

To this it may be replied, that the subject is mysterious, and we cannot expect words to be clearly explained which are used to express a mystery. But if the subject be mysterious, then, for conscience sake let it stand in the words of *inspiration*, and not in the words of *human wisdom* or *human folly*. If the texts of scripture which are supposed to support the proposition be mysterious beyond explanation, is it any thing short of extreme presumption to pretend to explain them, or to form a proposition in other words as expressive of their import? And especially to do this, by a combination of terms which no human being can unravel or explain?

If these passages of scripture be really of mysterious and inexplicable import, and the proposition founded on them be so likewise, how can any man know the *meaning* of either, or

whether they are *accordant*, or *discordant*, with each other? Can these things be known otherwise than by special inspiration? And if the *import* of the proposition be *unknown*, can it be less than absurd to attempt to support it by the *unknown meaning* of any passages of scripture? In such an effort do not men attempt to support *they know not what*, and by, *they know not what*?

Some will, probably, think that giving up the proposition, is giving up a fundamental article of the Christian faith. But if its *meaning* be *unknown*, how can any one *know* that it contains any *gospel doctrine*? For surely this form of words is not found in the Bible. And if the *meaning* be *not known* it cannot be made to appear that giving up the article is giving up any *divine truth*.

It may, also, be said, that giving up this proposition will be giving up a doctrine which has, for many ages, been a source of comfort to the friends of Christ. But which class of the trinitarians have been the partakers of this supposed comfort? Or have all the various classes been alike comforted? If the comfort has been the *same to all*, has it not resulted from the *sound* rather than the *meaning* of words? Or shall we say that the various and contradictory meanings have been alike conducive to comfort? But what shall be said of that class who have admitted the article without affixing *any meaning* to the terms? Have they, also, had a *share* in the comfort? If so, on what ground has it resulted?

It may, perhaps, be supposed by some, that the comfort has in a great measure resulted from the *humility* implied in admitting, as true, a proposition which is so *perfectly mysterious* and *unintelligible*. But if this be the ground of the comfort, must not some deduction be made from the *supposed amount*, on account of the *pride* of those several classes who have attempted to *explain the mystery* or to tell the *meaning of the term*? And must not the greater portion of the comfort be set to the account of those who have been so *very humble* as to receive the *form of words*, as sound, without *pretending to know their meaning*, or even making *any serious inquiry* respecting *their import*?

On the whole, is it not worthy of the most serious inquiry whether the supposed comfort has not resulted chiefly from the *popularity* of the *mystery*, and the opinion that true piety and the true church have been found only among trinitarians?

But, in calculating the *real benefit* of trinitarianism to the Christian world, it may be proper to have *some* respect to the *evils* of which it has been *productive*. It has unquestionably been an occasion of *great perplexity* and *embarrassment* to such trinitarians as have been much in the habit of thinking and inquiry. It *may* have been the occasion of much *dissimulation* with many who have had too great regard to their own popularity. It has, in time past, been the occasion of considerable *animosity* among different classes of its advocates. It has been the occasion of much *bitterness* and *alienation* between those who have embraced the article and those by whom it has been rejected. This bitterness and censoriousness has been the occasion of *great grief* to pious souls of every denomination. Add to these evils, the enormous flood of *sinful revilings*, poured forth by the contending parties, and the *uncomfortable* and *unchristian feelings* which they have indulged one towards another.

Now, from the sum total of the *supposed good*, deduct the sum total of the *real evils* and *mischiefs*; then let CANDOR estimate the *net amount* of *real benefit* to the Christian world; and will it not pronounce on the *contested proposition* as Jehovah did on the *useless Monarch* of Babylon;—"TEKEL, *thou art weighed in the balances and art found wanting?*"



ON THE ACCURACY AND FIDELITY OF GRIESBACH.

Mr. Editor,

IN consequence of some late discussions, with respect to the authority of the received reading of some important texts in the New Testament, discussions connected with the estimate to be made of the edition of Griesbach's New Testament, lately re-printed at Cambridge, I have been led to review the grounds on which the received readings have been discarded, with a particular view to the accuracy of the learned German editor. If

you find the following remarks suited to the design of your miscellany, you may, by inserting them, oblige some who are interested in these critical inquiries.

It has been said, and we think with reason, that the texts, so often quoted in the trinitarian controversy, Acts xx. 28. and 1 Tim. iii. 16. should be no more quoted in their present form, as proof passages. This assertion we presume is founded on an examination of the authorities, which have been produced by several critics, for and against the received readings of these texts; and is entirely coincident with the conclusions of Griesbach, as well as with the opinion of many of the most learned modern critics of every denomination.

But it has been asserted, that Griesbach has in some cases "marked his texts incorrectly, and made mistakes in citing his "authorities;" and as a suspicion of this kind may affect the confidence, which those, who have not the opportunity to examine for themselves, may have placed in his decisions, it becomes of importance to attend to the objections, which have been made to some parts of his statements in relation to these texts.

It is not, we believe, denied, that Griesbach's judgment as to the weight of evidence *against* the reading ~~Θεω~~ Acts xx. 28. is justified by his authorities, nor will it be said, that, according to the laws of criticism, the common reading can be retained in the text. The text could not stand thus, even if the inaccuracies, which have been imputed to Griesbach, could be proved; for they would not essentially affect the amount of evidence against the reading ~~Θεω~~ in this verse.

On this text Griesbach is charged with saying, that the Arabic version in the Polyglot has the reading *Lord and God* (*κυριου και θεου*), whereas it is well known that it reads *Lord God*.—The truth is, that Griesbach, in citing, enumerating, and arranging his authorities in the proper place, has correctly given to the Ar. Pol. the reading *κυριου θεου*; and in *this* place, where the authorities for the different readings in question are *expressly* presented, should we look for the grounds of his critical decisions.—But it seems that Griesbach two or three pages after, in *remarking* upon his authorities, and comparing the countenance which they give to different readings in this passage, represents

the Ar. Pol. as "patronizing" the reading *αγγελος και θεος*. Now it is difficult to reconcile these two places, except by supposing what is almost incredible, that Griesbach in the 115th page had forgotten that he had quoted Ar. Pol. in the 113th for another reading; or by supposing that the phrase, *Versio nulla huius lectioni* (viz. *αγγελος και θεος*) *patrocinator*, præter Arabicam Polyglottorum, &c. did not, in his mind, amount to the same thing, with asserting that the Arabic of the Polyglot *has* that reading.—The reading *αγγελος και θεος* is manifestly made up of two readings from different books. As a proof of this, Griesbach adduces the reading *αγγελος θεος* (without the copula) in cod. 3. and *θεος και αγγελος* in an inverted order in cod. 47. Could he therefore in his summary rank these three readings *Lord God*, *Lord and God*, *God and Lord*, in the same class, and think them undeserving of a separate discussion? However this may be, it is not strictly just to charge Griesbach with "citing his authorities" on this text "incorrectly," where he has certainly *quoted* them with accuracy, however in his subsequent remarks he may seem inconsistent with himself.—It is to be wished that those, who possess the first edition of his critical Greek Testament, would examine it, in order to ascertain whether after Mill and Wetstein, he does not there *quote* the Ar. Pol. for the reading *Lord and God*. If he does, it may be that in correcting the error in the last edition, he forgot to alter the *passage*, which afterwards appears inconsistent with his authorities.

Another of the *αγγελιαφοροι* ascribed to Griesbach in his note upon this text is, that he says the word *egziabeher* is always employed in the Ethiopic version to render both the Greek words, *αγγελος* and *θεος*. By this he has been supposed to mean, that wherever *αγγελος* or *θεος* occurs, they are each invariably rendered throughout the New Testament by the Ethiopic word in question. But it is utterly incredible that Griesbach should have intended thus; for a slight inspection of the Eth. vers. even in this chap. of the Acts would show one, much less acquainted with the subject than Griesbach, that *αγγελος* is sometimes rendered by another Ethiopic word. Gilbert Wakefield, in his note on this verse, pronounces most violently that the

assertion of Griesbach here is "infamously false:" "On the contrary," says Wakefield, "as far as my recollection will carry me, this translator *never* employs the words here introduced but to signify the *supreme God alone*." This language is rash, rude, and unjustifiable. It is true that the Ethiopic translator continually employs the word *egziabeher*, "sive $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ in Græca veritate legatur, sive $\kappa\upsilon\varsigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$." We believe that where $\kappa\upsilon\varsigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ occurs in the Greek the use of the Ethiopic word in question commonly implies, that the translator *understood the supreme Jehovah to be meant*; but by no means that $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ was the Greek word in the original. The use of the Ethiopic word only proves how the translator interpreted the passage. It *admits* of his having read $\kappa\upsilon\varsigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ in the original Greek, but cannot *prove* that he read $\kappa\upsilon\varsigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ or $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ — Much more is the testimony of the Ethiopic version neutralized, if it be shown (as it has been) that the Ethiopic version sometimes translates $\kappa\upsilon\varsigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ by *egziabeher* where Christ is certainly meant by $\kappa\upsilon\varsigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$.

There can be no doubt then of the strict accuracy of Griesbach's remark on the testimony of the Ethiopic version; "that, if it be *alone* regarded, it favors neither reading, $\kappa\upsilon\varsigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ nor $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$."

What is the reason then, which Griesbach assigns for believing the Ethiopic version to have read $\kappa\upsilon\varsigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ here, rather than $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$? It is, that the Coptic and Armenian versions, with which the Ethiopic commonly agrees, here read $\kappa\upsilon\varsigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$. He does not come to this conclusion from the neutral character of the Ethiopic word; but this neutrality or ambiguity being first proved, he can then argue from the versions, with which the Ethiopic commonly agrees; and this neutrality is as well established by a small as by a greater number of examples. "It is sufficient to show that the Ethiopic, in this place, is *ambiguous*, if the word, which it employs, is put, *sometimes* for God, sometimes for the Lord."*

Such, we believe, is the state of facts with respect to the Ethiopic version in this place. And those, who think Griesbach has expressed himself carelessly in saying as he does, *Æthiops habet vocabulum quo semper utitur*, (for, as Facciolatus

* Chr. Obs.

observes, SEMPER adverbium est latissimi usus,) must perceive that no one of his conclusions, with respect to the testimony of this version, can be affected by interpreting his words in a manner inconsistent with truth. The conclusion must be the same as to the reading of this text, whether the Ethiopic translator uses the word *egziabehet* invariably, and without exception, wherever *αυτος* or *δies* is found in the New Testament; or whether he uses this word *commonly, generally, frequently*; or whether he uses it only in *some* instances where *αυτος* occurs, meaning Christ or God.

With regard to the accuracy of Griesbach in giving his authorities for the various readings of *δies*, *is*, and *i* in 1 Tim. iii. 16. no accusation is made but what is implied in the assertion, that some passages of the fathers are "clear quotations" of *δies*, from which passages Griesbach asserts, it can by no means be collected that they read *δies*, which it certainly could be, if it were *clear*, that they quoted this passage as it now stands.

In order to understand this subject, where passages of the Fathers are brought in support of a particular reading, it must be remembered that the fathers often quote from memory, and still oftener paraphrastically. Therefore, where they used *some* of the words *now* contained in a passage, it is not to be hastily concluded that the passage then contained the words which they use, because, unless they expressly and formally quote the text itself, it is possible that the words in question may be only their interpretation. This becomes probable, when from *other* reasons it appears that the passage in the copies of those times stood differently from its present form. Let us illustrate this by an example.

The following passage has been produced from the Apostolical Constitutions, as a "clear quotation" of the received reading in 1 Tim. iii. 16. viz. *δies αὐτος ὁ επιφανὴς ἡμῶν ὡς εὐαγγ.* Now it is plain that this is not a *literal* quotation of any passage in the New Testament. The phrase in Timothy is *δies ἐφανέρωτο ὡς εὐαγγ.* of course there are but *three words out of eight* in the Apostolical Constitutions, which are contained in the received Greek text of the New Testament; yet it is said, that this is a "clear quotation" of a disputed text.

Any one who will take the trouble to read Wetstein's note on this text, will see how common it was for the fathers to use phrases of the kind here observed, without any precisely similar form of words in the New Testament. Now as this place has no appearance of a *quotation*, except so far as it conveys a meaning like that of the received text in Timothy, and as it is known that this text was never produced in its present form by the Catholic fathers in their disputes on the trinity before the fifth century, if language like that used in the Apostolical Constitutions can be explained in any other way, than by supposing *Θεὸς φανερωθεῖς* originally in this text, it is agreeable to the rules of just criticism so to explain it. Now Wetstein and Griesbach say, that from the use of such phrases by the fathers as that in the passage adduced, it can only be concluded that the writers interpreted in this way the rather obscure expression (*difficilior et insolentior lectio*) *ἰ* or *ἐς φανερωθεῖς*.

We should be glad to transcribe the whole of Wetstein's note on this text, which is full of curious information; but we will confine ourselves to that part of Griesbach's, which particularly relates to this subject of quotations.

" Of the Greek fathers it is to be observed,

" 1. That in the earliest times this passage [in any form] is " very rarely appealed to by the fathers, not even against the " Arians in the beginning of the Arian controversy. Neither " does Cyril Alex: appeal to this text against the emperor Julian, who denied that Jesus was ever called God by Paul; " nor does Cyril oppose the word *Θεὸς* to Nestorius.

" 2. Whether the reading were *ἰ* or *ἐς* this passage might " be referred to by the [Greek] fathers, as we have already " remarked was done by the Latins. Hence some were accused to name Christ himself *μυστήριον* [the mystery]. And " Justin v. c. in his epistle to Diognetus could write: *ἀποστολὰς τῶν λόγων ἵνα κόσμῳ φανῇ κ. τ. λ.* [i.e. He sent the LOGOS to appear " in the world, who, when proclaimed by the apostles, was believed on by the Gentiles.]—Origen contra Cels. 3. *ἁρτις ὁ θεὸς ἀναλαμβάνεται λεγόμενος* [JESUS is said to be taken up into " glory.]—The same father is thus translated by Rufinus on " Rom. i. 2. ' Is qui VERBUM caro factus apparuit positus in

"carne, sicut apostolus dicit, *QUIA* (fortasse, *QUI*) manifestatus est in carne, justificatus etc.'—Theodotus Epitome 18. ὁ *σα* *της οφθης πατιων της αγγελου.* [The SAVIOUR in his humiliation was seen by angels.]—Basil. Ep. 65. *το μεγαλη μυστηριον οτι ο κυριος εμφανισθη εν σαρκι* [the great mystery that the LORD was manifested in flesh.]—The author of the Apostolical Constitutions, vii. 26. [as quoted above, *God, Lord who hast appeared to us in flesh.*]—Hippolytus contra Noetum 17, *ις ος προελθον εις κορμηι θις εν σαρκι* [though the same Hippolytus has *θις και ανθρωπος* in Theodoret] *εμφανισθη.* [the same, coming forth into the world, GOD was manifested in a body.] Gregory Thaumaturgus or rather Apollinaris ap. Phot. cod. 230. and others: *θις εν σαρκι φανερωθη* [*God manifested in flesh.*] From such phrases therefore, and from the application of the expressions found in this text to Christ, *it is by no means to be collected, that these fathers read θις.*" Griesb. nota ad loc. vol. 2. p. 430.

We need an apology, Mr. Editor, to your intelligent readers for having said so much on so plain a subject. But the section just translated from Griesbach contains some of the passages from the fathers, which are supposed to be "clear quotations" of the received reading of this text in Timothy. Now any one acquainted with what is meant by a quotation must see, that if these are quotations, one of them has as fair a claim to be so as another; and then it will be impossible to conjecture what the text quoted was; or if *any one* of them is a verbal quotation, then the whole verse 1 Tim. iii. 16. in our present copies has been so mutilated, as to be entirely metamorphosed.

It is *another* thing to say that this place in Tim. may be "referred to" in these passages from the fathers. This is probable, though by no means necessary, because there are other places, such as John i. 14, and Coloss. i. 26, which may also be referred to by these phrases in the fathers. But a mere *reference* to a passage which the writer had in his mind cannot be used as a source of various readings; especially where it can be shown that his language is only his own interpretation of the original words, and not an express citation of them.

Those who would understand the importance and use of quotations from the fathers in critical inquiries, may derive some information from the chapters in Michaelis on this subject; but we know of no place where it may be sooner understood how much is necessary to constitute a quotation from the New Testament, than by attending to the Appendix to Mark's Illustrations of his Hypothesis, where are reviewed the supposed quotations in Justin M. from the four canonical Gospels; and it is shown, that if these are maintained to be quotations from our commonly received gospels, the gospels have come down to us in so mutilated a state, that it would be impossible to receive them, as authentic copies of the original.

But to return to Griesbach. Of the LATIN FATHERS he says, p. 430, "All the Latin fathers of every age read *mysterium f. sacramentum quod manifestatum etc.* although they "might understand it of Christ." So Hilary, Augustine, Pelagius, Julian pelagian: Fulgentius, Idacius, Ambrosiaster, Leo M. Victorinus, Cassian, Gregory the Great, Vigilius tapsensis, Beda, Chrysologus, Martinus I. in epistle to John Philadelphus in Mansi's Collection of Councils vol. x. p. 813. (but in the Greek version in that place we find *αἱ*.)—Jerome alone on Issi. liii. 11. and the Acts of the 2d council of Constant. (ap. Mans. vol. ix. p. 221.) have in Latin as follows; *Qui manifestatus est in carne, justificatus est in spiritu.*

Some critics seem to have supposed, that Griesbach is not correct in this statement, because there is a passage in Lactantius, which (in their opinion) is a "clear quotation" of the present reading in Timothy. The passage is as follows. "Itaque idcirco mediator advenit, id est Deus in carne, ut caro eum sequi posset, et eriperet morti hominem," &c. But the only words in this passage, which can be made even to refer to the text in Timothy, are the three words, *Deus in carne*, a phrase continually occurring in the writings of the fathers, and which may as well be referred to three or four other texts as to this in Timothy. No collector of various readings would have ever thought of citing this passage as an authority for a particular reading; for if such phrases are to pass for citations of particular phrases of the New Testament, it may be said

that wherever the phrases, *Son of God, only begotten*, &c. occur, the writer "clearly quotes" a particular text in the New Testament. Whatever text then we may suppose Lactantius to refer to, (if indeed he had any particular text in his mind,) there is no more propriety in alleging this passage as a quotation of the text in Timothy, than as a quotation of John i. 14.

There is also a passage produced from Gregory Nyssen as a *clear quotation* of 1 Tim. iii. 16, and it is regarded as another proof of Griesbach's inaccuracy, that he has placed Gregory among that class of writers, whose reference to this text is doubtful, and this without the least notice that his works contain any thing decided upon the subject.

But the true state of the case will be seen from the following passage in Griesbach's note.

"Some fathers, who have been usually cited for the reading *Θεός*, are either improperly adduced, or are not placed beyond doubt; for example: Athanasius ad Serapion: Ep. 4. and de Incarnatione, t. 3. p. 33. But in the former place most manuscripts omit the words, which are adduced for this purpose. The Oratio de Incarnatione however is not Athanasius's. Of Cyril Alexandrinus we have before spoken." [We would advise those who would understand the value of some of the quotations from the fathers in favor of *Θεός*, to read Griesbach's remarks on the passages from Cyril in his Symbol. Crit. tom. i. p. xliii. to which Griesbach here refers.] "And to this place should Gregory Nyssen be referred, to whom indeed the editors of his works attribute *Θεός αφαιρέτως*; but Gregory in his Antirrhēt. adv. Apollinar. p. 138, says, το μυστήριον το σαρκεν αφαιρέτως· καλος ταυτο λεγουν· ουτως ε' εμμενους λεγους. WHEREFORE, he seems to have read *ε*, or even *ος*."

Now it is evident that Griesbach does not conceal that *Θεός αφαιρέτως* is found in Gregory Nyssen. On the contrary he admits that his works as now edited contain this phrase. Wetstein too says expressly, "Gregorius Nyssenus, ut nunc quidem editus est sæpissime," i. e. habet *Θεός*. Neither does Griesbach with respect to this father confine his assertion (itaque legisse videtur, &c.) to the passage he has here quoted, and say

merely that he seems to have read *δ* in this passage. No. On the contrary, Griesbach concludes from this passage that he could not have read *δ* at all, and that where *δ* is found, it is to be ascribed to editors; and therefore that Gregory Nyssen is to be referred to the class of authorities, who "aut perperam afferuntur, aut non extra dubitationem positi sunt." The reader may also see, in Wetstein's note upon this verse, some other passages adduced from Gregory Nyssen, which confirm the opinion, that he could not have read *δ* in this text. The same mode of reasoning affixes a strong degree of suspicion on some other passages of the fathers alleged in this dispute; but to put our readers in possession of the whole subject, it would be necessary to transcribe a great part of Wetstein's note. We will conclude this part of the subject with the following words of Wetstein. "Interim non diffiteor, minime mihi probari confidentiam atque acerbiter T. Bezae, cujus hæc sunt verba in l. *δ* *ἀποκρυφῶς ἐν οὐρανῷ* ' Vix alius locus est, in quo omnia redemptionis nostræ mysteria vel magnificentius vel planius explicantur; ut non mirum sit, *fæde fuisse a diabolo depravatum*; cui sane hac in parte (dicam enim libere quod res est) suam operam imprudens quidem (sic enim arbitror) sed suam operam tamen *Erasmus commodavit*; ita videlicet profitens Christi divinitatem, ut tamen pro viribus passim conetur luculentissima et certissima quæque ejus testimonia nobis extorquere. Exemplo sit hic locus.' Ingenuitatem vero atque judicium *Calvini* utroque pollice laudo, qui in l. 'ut demus,' inquit, 'nomen Dei non fuisse expressum a Paulo, subaudiendum tamen esse Christi nomen, fatebitur, quisquis prudenter omnia expendet.'" We beg leave in partes Calvini stare.

The accuracy and fidelity of Griesbach on this verse cannot be fully seen and estimated without taking the pains to be acquainted with the previous labors of Wetstein, and without understanding the critical use of quotations from the fathers in cases like these.

On the celebrated text of the three heavenly witnesses it is not pretended, that Griesbach has not very fully and fairly stated all the authorities of consequence for or against the verse in

question. Some persons have imagined, that the confession of the African bishops has not been sufficiently accounted for by the critics, who have contended against the verse. However this may be, from all that we have seen we rather discover a disposition to cast into the shade the objections, which have been raised against this authority, and to give it an importance to which it is by no means entitled. It is said that Porson was preparing a new edition of his letters to Travis, in which he meant to strengthen or set in a stronger light his reasonings on the subject of this African confession, but death interrupted this and other works of that learned man.

To those who are inclined to think the authenticity of this verse only "doubtful, or a proper subject of future inquiry," we recommend the conclusion of Griesbach's *Diatrise*, who, (*si quis alius*) is a critic, competent from his orthodoxy, as well as critical sagacity, to determine this question.

This is the conclusion of his remarks on the three heavenly witnesses. "If such few, dubious, suspicious, and recent testimonies, and arguments so light, may suffice to demonstrate the genuineness of any reading, there would be no criterion at all remaining of true and false in criticism, and the whole text of the New Testament would be altogether doubtful and uncertain. *I myself, if it were of importance enough, would undertake to defend six hundred of the most futile and universally rejected readings, by testimonies and reasons equal-ly numerous and valid, nay in general more numerous and valid, than those which the patrons of this verse make use of; nor could the defenders of a genuine text have so many and so good arguments to oppose to any such absurd attempt of mine, as have been above brought against the defenders of this text. I wish those would seriously consider this, who may happen to take upon themselves a new defence of this verse—*"

It has been suggested also that Griesbach is guilty of some unfairness in printing Heb. i. 8. without separating *et* *Deus* by commas, as if he would thus make it appear to be in the nominative case. On the contrary, if he had marked off *et* *Deus* by commas, there would have been some reason for the accusation of partiality, as it would be in fact printing the text so as

to justify a particular interpretation of it, which is by no means so clear and indisputable that an editor should take this method of fixing and transmitting it by a typographical manœuvre. As the text is now printed, the reader is very properly advertised of the variety of punctuation, in the manual edition by a note, and in the critical by the usual asterisks. Thus is preserved the ambiguity of the original Hebrew, and thus too is observed the mode of printing the text in all the copies of the Septuagint, which we have seen; for, though the custom of separating vocatives by commas is not strictly regarded in the editions of the Septuagint, yet there are cases in which it is observed. The two portions of the verse in the original are parallel clauses, and the parallelism is most strictly preserved by not insulating ὁ Θεός, thereby admitting the following translation:

Ὁ Θεὸς οὐ ὁ Θεὸς οἰς τοὶ αἰῶνι τῶ αἰῶνος
Ῥαβδος ὑψιτητος ἡ ραβδος τῆς βασιλείας σου.

Thy throne is God forever and ever,
A sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom.

Griesbach has here done, what the strictest impartiality required, and what no one, who is not biassed by theological prejudices, can disapprove.

It has also been doubted whether the manual edition of Griesbach's New Testament has a fair title to be considered as containing the last results of his critical labors. But one would think that the testimony of Griesbach himself were sufficient to settle this point. In the preface to his manual edition, he expressly says, "Textus in hac editione expressus idem est,—quem in *Halensi secunda* ~~EX~~CUDI CURAVI. Nam ab hoc, si perpaucos et nullius fere momenti locos excipias, non erat cur recedendum." It appears then from Griesbach's own words, that the text of his critical edition, at least as much of it as was contained in the first incomplete publication of the manual edition, WAS ALREADY PRINTED, when he wrote the preface to the manual edition. But it appears that the preface of the manual edition bears date April 1805, and of the critical edition April 1806. To account for this difference in the times of publication, it is necessary to read the preface to

the critical edition, from which it appears that many years elapsed from the time, when this critical edition was committed to the press till it was finally published. The reasons of this delay are detailed in the preface, from which it also appears, that the volume began to be printed before the year 1799, and that when Griesbach received White's edition of the Philoxenian version, (which, as it was a time of peace, we may suppose to have been soon after it was published) the greater part of the catholic epistles had been given to the printed, though the completion and final publication of the critical edition was suspended till 1806.

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

MOORE'S ANACREON.

*Quid, nisi cum multo venerem confundere vino,
Præcepit lyrici Teia Musa senis?*

OVID: TRIST:

FEW poets of the present age can boast, that their works have circulated more extensively, than those of Mr. Moore. His popularity seems to have increased at every publication. The translation of Anacreon appeared about nine years ago, and occupied the second place in the order of time. It has been less noticed by the critics than any of his works. In this country it has attracted the attention of only two literary journals, and on the whole has received a degree of applause, which many think considerably above its merits. In England it has hardly been more thoroughly reviewed, though the impression, it has produced, seems to have been more correct. Indeed we have sought in vain for any foreign publication, which pretends to examine it in the only character, to which it openly and seriously aspires;—we have no where found it fairly decided, whether this is, or is not, a translation of Anacreon. Why this task has been so long neglected, and by what peculiar good fortune Mr. Moore has so long escaped the common fate of authorship, we are unable to conjecture; but we think it is quite time to examine the pretensions of a work, which has passed through so many editions in Great Britain and America, that it has become as familiar to the general reader as almost any volume in the body of English poetry.

It has been the felicity, perhaps the object, of Mr. Moore, to render his work popular. He has succeeded, where translators in general have failed; for he has made the English version of a Greek poet interesting to mere English readers. Whether in doing this he has not forgotten his highest duty,

whether he has not sacrificed fidelity to a false taste for elegance, and sought for ornament, when he should have sought for that simplicity of style, which is his author's grand characteristic—are points, that we mean to examine with some care.

To begin however at the commencement, we must confess our dissatisfaction and disappointment at the life of Anacreon, contained in his "prefatory remarks." It is meagre and uninteresting, not so much because he wanted materials, as because he wanted industry to collect those, which were remote and scattered, while he affected to discredit those, which he found ready to his hand. We call his doubts *affected*, because he spurns at accounts received by Fabricius and Barpes, Bayle and La Harpe. The anecdotes, he refuses to repeat, cannot, perhaps, be proved to be true, because remote antiquity is always involved in doubt; but they are certainly characteristic. Anacreon may never have been placed in the situations they represent; but, if he had, the consequences would have been such, as they have assigned. The accounts may be false; but all internal evidence is in their favor. Mr. Moore, however, does not stop here. He not only rejects them himself, but treats with unpardonable contempt all who acknowledge and repeat them. He begins at the very threshold, by saying, "There is little known with certainty of the life of Anacreon;" and calls the accounts commonly received, "the specious fabrications of his editors," who, "supplying the deficiency of materials by fictions of their own imagination, have arranged what they call a life of Anacreon." This is a part of his first paragraph, and may be considered a fair specimen of the gentlemanly manner, in which he treats his predecessors. It is true, that we have no regular life of Anacreon earlier than Suidas, and even his text is thought by Bayle to be corrupt;* but it is equally true, that industry will find detached sketches in almost every prose-writer of antiquity, even in the dialogues of Plato and the disquisitions of Pliny the elder.

After all, it is of little consequence through what medium we view the character of Anacreon. Though we should form

* Ne decidons rien sur Suidas. Son texte est assurément corrompu.

Bayle in Anac: Not! B.

our opinions from the trifling accounts of his life, or even from the medals yet extant, we should not probably be deceived. He has no disguise, and every action of his life, as well as every lineament of his countenance, betrays some feature of his disposition. But these are not all from which we are to judge.

Nec, si quid olim lusit Anacreon,
Delerit ætas. Hor. 4, Od. 9, 9.

Time has spared about seventy odes, and editorial research has added a few epigrams and fragments. In these we find him sometimes offering incense to the god of Love, sometimes sacrificing to Bacchus, and sometimes uniting in the service of both.

Every circumstance of time and place seems to have augured his success. He lived in an age so early, that the excellence to which he aspired was unoccupied, and yet so late, that his native Ionic had attained all its sweetness and harmony. Of his country, if it be not enough to say that he was a Greek, we will add, that he was born in Teos, and spent a part of his life at Athens.

He commenced his career alone, and in the course of his progress he found neither obstacle nor limit. The whole field was open before him, and he had no competitors to stimulate and no models to direct him. To this exemption from all the usual feelings and motives of an author we probably owe the ease and freedom of his manner. He appears to write entirely for personal gratification, and never stops to inquire, whether any body will sympathize in his feelings. Every sentiment of his heart and every expression of his song, is as simple as nature. He has no elaborateness, no artifice, no affectation. It is the token of Anacreon's imagination, that he dwells in generals. He never attempts to magnify the thought by exaggeration, or render it more imposing by the accumulation of epithets, but suffers it to rest on its proper centre, and pass for its intrinsic worth. He neglects ornament, not because he scorns it, but because he does not think of it; and he writes at all, only because his heart is full, and utterance is his relief and pleasure.

But, reverse the medal, and we find him, like his statue* in the streets of Athens, a mere intoxicated ballad-singer. His productions have indeed that fresh hue and elastic character, which are the peculiar inheritance of great minds; but they are foul with corrupt sentiments, licentious imagery, and prurient descriptions. It is true he is always gay and festive; but his levity is not like the cheerfulness of one, whose heart is habitually at ease, who sports with the creatures of his own imagination, and is heedless of consequences, only because he does not foresee them. It is the tumultuous joy of a sensualist, whose understanding and affections are equally depraved, and who looks with a careless contempt on every thing like propriety, honor, and virtue. If the world ever produced a perfect voluptuary, Anacreon was the man. Pleasure absorbs his whole soul, and every thing around him affords him satisfaction, exactly in proportion as it ministers to his two predominating passions. If he finds enjoyment in conversation, it is only over the bowl;† and if he praises the beauty of spring, it is because it is the season of love.‡ There seems to be a continual struggle throughout his writings, not between good principles and bad, not between the decisions of his judgment and the impulse of his passions, but between two degrading vices; and we rise from the perusal of most of his odes, doubting with Didymus the rhetorician, *an libidiniosior Anacreon, an ebriosior vixerit.*§

Uniting grossness of principle with uncommon purity of manner, Anacreon must undoubtedly be a difficult author to translate. His luxurious softness, his delicacy of colouring, and distinctness of imagery are lost in a version; while, at the same time, their absence renders his impurity more obvious and offensive. The translator finds he cannot succeed; but, instead of surrendering in despair, he endeavours to conceal his defects under the splendor and amplification of his style. He expands the thought, gives it a point and smartness unknown to the original, and, in fact, writes as Anacreon would have written, if he had possessed less feeling and more rhetoric.

Mr. Moore's first error is in the selection of a text. He

* Pausanias lib. i. c. 25.

† Epig. 7.

‡ Ode 62.

§ Senec. Ep. 88.

follows the order and, with few exceptions, adopts the readings of the Vatican MS. which the industry of all the editors, from Stephanus to Fischer, has been employed to correct. To be sure, if he determined to receive any MS. without alteration or amendment, he did wisely to take the Vatican; because it is the most perfect, but it is necessarily less so, than the modern printed text. Granting him, however, the reading he has chosen, it is still a curious inquiry, why he should differ from all the editors and translators, in his arrangement.

To come, at last, to the manual labor of criticism, let us examine the second ode as it stands in the translation, but the forty eighth according to Fischer. Here we shall find Anacreon extended from eight to twenty lines with numerous interpolations and much loss of spirit. The passages printed in *Italics* are not authorized by the original.

Δός μοι λύραν Ὀμηρεν, κ. τ. λ.

Give me the harp of *epic song*,
Which Homer's finger thrilled along,
But, *tear away* the sanguine string,
For war is not the theme I sing.
Proclaim the laws of festal rite—
I'm monarch of the board to night,*
And all around shall brim as high
And quaff the tide as deep as I!
And when the clusters' mellowing dews
Their warm enchanting balm infuse,
Our feet shall catch th' elastic bound,
And reel us through the dance's round.
Oh Bacchus! we shall sing to thee
In wild but sweet ebriety,
And flash around such sparks of thoughts
As Bacchus could alone have taught:
Then give the harp of *epic song*,
Which Homer's finger thrilled along,
But *tear away* the sanguine string,
For war is not the theme I sing.

This ode has almost lost its identity. It has suffered not

* We have marked from the sixth to the twelfth lines inclusive because there is no trace of them in the original, except

——— τῶν τε ἑστῶτων,
Μέθυσεν ἰππὸς χορὸν αὖτις.

only by insertions, but by omissions. We look in vain for a translation of *βαρύνων αὐδον*, and for the clamorous exultation of a bacchanal, so admirably expressed by *βαρυνω*. Its faults will be more obvious, when compared with a literal translation.

‘ Give me the lyre of Homer, without its bloody string.
‘ Bring me the lawful cups, bring *them* to me, that I may temper the wine.* When I am drunken, I will dance,† and, singing to my harp with the inspiration of ebriety, I will be clamorous in harmony.’‡

The reason why Mr. Moore in this and similar instances has fallen into such gross mistakes is, that instead of consulting the original, he has followed the errors of other translations. In the third line, and in the conclusion of this ode, he was misled by an irregular metrical version of Longepierre, published in 1692.

Donner moi la lyre d' Homère
Mais otez-en la corde meurtrière.

In the two last lines we find the prototypes of Mr. Moore's “sweet ebriety,” and “sparkles of thought,” and the mention of Bacchus, none of which are in the Greek.

Dans un emportement exempt de violence
Je m' épanche en bons mots et célèbre Bacchus.

One entire ode is probably enough, and we shall therefore confine our future remarks to an exposition of his interpolations, omissions, and mistakes, as we find them scattered through the book. The following are amusing specimens of his unreasonable amplification.

Βαρὺς κυπύλλον ἵδρυ· Ode 18. l. 2.

Deep as the rich and holy vase,
Which on the shrine of spring reposes,
When shepherds hail that hour of roses. Ode 5.

In the thirty second ode he enumerates his loves as they had

* *Ναμυνος παρασκευασι* est miscere vinum tot partibus aquæ, quot misceri illud leges computationis jubent. Fisch. ad loc.

† Nemo saltat sobrius, nisi forte insanit. Cic. pro Mur.

* *Παρυνω* intell. *αερμα* vel *μελος*. Fisch. ad loc.

occurred at different places, and at Corinth he says he had a multitude.

Ἐπεὶ δ' ἐν Κορίνθῳ
Θεὸς ἰσχυρὸς ἔρωτος. I. 11.

In the sweet Corinthian grove,
Where the glowing wanton's rove,
Chains of beauties may be found,
Chains by which my heart is bound;—
These, indeed, are girls divine,
Dangerous to a soul like mine. Ode 14.

————Καθυδω. Ode 9. l. 34.

Dreaming still of dulcet numbers.

Οὐκ ἔτι—Ode 16. l. 5.

'Twas not the crested warrior's dart
That drank the current of my heart.

Μυμνηστικὸς—Ode 41. l. 22. is fantastically paraphrased;

Let me imbibe the spicy breath
Of odours, chafed to fragrant death.

It would be worse than useless to add more examples to this list. No man can suppose, that such a translator is faithful to his author any further, than he finds fidelity convenient.

With so much superfluous matter, we have certainly a right to expect all the ideas of the original. Indeed one fault seems to exclude the other, for we should naturally suppose, that amplification would not be resorted to, until all other resources were exhausted. Yet it is not so. Either from an unpardonable degree of negligence, or from want of skill in the language, from which he translated, he is guilty of frequent and important omissions. Ex. gr. In ode 18 he has passed over two highly picturesque lines, in which Anacreon orders a splendid vine to be engraved on his cup:

Κ' ἀμπέλιν στυπταλὸν,
Εὐβοτέρων, καμύσαν—l. 17.

In Ode 31 he has omitted the circumstance that the fatal *arnas* of Ajax were a present from Hector:

Τῷ Ἐκτορὸς μάχαιραν—l. 15.

In his version of the twenty ninth Ode, which is one of his happiest efforts, the following passage has no parallel:

Εχτων δ', ὅπως πικρὰ,
Τὸ λαλῶσθαι συνεφρον'
Βλαφερῶν ἵππῳ κελαινῷ.—15—17.

Ode 53, line 3, he has suppressed the invocation to his companions:

Συνταῖροι, αὐξὲ μιλῶν—

and two other lines:

Παρε τῶν σοφῶν καλυπτῶν—23.
Φοδὶρας δ' αὖθις Ὀλυμπῶν—35.

Ode 51.

Νοεὺς ἔστι δ' αὖθις αἰθέρας
Μακάρων φυνίος ἀρχαί—7 & 8.

The preceding examples are sufficient to prove the charge of gross negligence; and if they were not, many more might be collected. The only difficulty attending this task is in distinguishing between perversions and omissions; and this is a very serious one, for many of Anacreon's ideas have undergone a transformation so completely, that those, to whom they were familiar in the original, would hardly recognize them in their present gaudy livery.

We have ventured to hint, that Mr. Moore's acquaintance with Greek is not so extensive, as the nature of his task demands. The observation was not dropped by accident, or hazarded rashly. It may seem dangerous to call in question the qualifications of a man, who introduces himself to his reader in a Greek ode of no ordinary length in the favorite metre of the author he professes to translate, and, if we pardon a few unharmonious lines, and some affectation of sentiment, considerably in his spirit, yet we can in no other way account for his frequent errors of interpretation, and his universal ill success, when he attempts the office of a critic.

In Ode 49, line 9, he has rendered

Ὁ δὲ κερὸς, αὖθις δ' αὖθις
Γραφὴ καὶ τοῖς φίλοις.

Paint me next, if painting may
Such a theme as this pourtray,
All the happy heaven of love,
These the elect of Cupid prove.

Passing over the amplification, the meaning of Anacreon is entirely mistaken. If Mr. Moore had compared this passage with the fourth line of the forty-eighth ode, where *νομος κεραιτων* occurs, he would have seen that it meant "the laws of lovers,"* *φιλος* being idiomatically put for the genitive.

In line 30, of the same ode he has followed the Vatican MS. in an error. The reading used since Baxter is

Φιλοπαιγμονος Βακχῳ*

Κομης μιν κκετ' υσας Ode 11, l. 4,

means absolute baldness, but Mr. Moore, seduced by the prettiness of the thought, or perhaps betrayed by a loose translation in Fawkes,† says,

The locks upon thy brow are few,
And like the rest, they're withering too.

Ode 32 at the conclusion;

Ου γαρ οθινα τσεντες

Ερωτας εκδωσται.

'For I cannot count so many loves.' In this case he probably took the usual meaning of *εκδωσται*, and with a little violence interpreted the passage 'frighten out with clamour,' and presuming that if they could *not* be frightened away, they would always remain there, he renders it,

No, no, I fear, alas, I fear
They will forever nestle here.

On the authority of Baxter, and for the sake of common sense, it is well to consider *εκδωσται*, synonymous with *κακηθρηνται*.

Speaking of love in ode 3, Mr. Moore says in the person of Anacreon:

I knew him by his bow and dart,
I knew him by my fluttering heart.

* Si la cire peut repondre a tes efforts peins *les loix des amans*. Traduc: en prose à Lyons 1780.

† "White and few alas! I find
"All that time has left behind."—Fawkes.

Now there is not only no authority for these lines in the original, but the course of events in the ode shows, that he did not suspect who was his guest, until the fatal wound was inflicted.

Other instances of misinterpretation may be found in ode 18, line 12—11. 4—45. 14—and 7. 11.

Of his critical skill, an opinion may be formed from the notes on odes 2, 3, 4, 31, and 59, as they stand in the translation. These are all we have examined, and in every instance he defends the reading which is generally rejected, or assumes the wrong meaning.

If we set its merits as a translation entirely out of the question, and consider only its literary worth as a volume of amatory verses, our censure will not be so unqualified. In Anacreon's longer and more elaborate pieces, where the subject can better sustain ornament, Mr. Moore has frequently been successful. The little stories of the dove, and of Cupid's artifice to get into Anacreon's house, are finely told. In description, his happiest efforts are the directions to the artist how to paint his mistress, and the address to the grasshopper. The last, as we consider it the finest piece in the collection, we extract entire.

Oh thou, of all creation blest,
Sweet insect! that delight'st to rest
Upon the wild woods' leafy tops,
To drink the dew, that morning drops,
And chirp thy song with such a glee,
That happiest kings may envy thee!
Whatever decks the velvet field,
Whate'er the circling seasons yield,
Whatever buds, whatever blows,
For thee it buds, for thee it grows.
Nor yet art thou the peasant's fear,
To him thy friendly notes are dear;
For thou art mild as matin dew,
And still, when Summer's flowery hue
Begins to paint the *bloomy* plain,
We hear thy sweet prophetic strain;
Thy sweet prophetic strain we hear,
And bless the notes and thee revere!
The Muses love thy *shrill* tone;
Apollo calls thee all his own;

'Twas he who gave thy voice to thee,
 'Tis he who tunes thy minstrelsy.
 Unworn by age's dim decline,
 The *fadeless* blooms of youth are thine.
 Melodious insect! child of earth!
 In wisdom mirthful, wise in mirth;
 Exempt from every weak decay,
 That withers vulgar frames away;
 With not a drop of blood to stain
 The current of thy purer vein;
 So blest an age is pass'd by thee,
 Thou seem'st—a little deity. Ode 34.

Mr. Moore's prominent fault as a poet is an affectation of epigrammatic conceits and glittering combinations. He does not seem to be satisfied with such thoughts and expressions as plain English and common sense will afford, but endeavours to find something out of the common course, something dazzling and pointed. Like Sancho, he wants better bread than can be made with wheat, and in the attempt to procure it, renders himself ridiculous.

If he describe a festive old age, he says:

Bacchus shall bid my winter bloom,
 And Venus dance me to the tomb. Ode 40.

The pleasures of drinking:

—Bacchus with the sunshine of the bowl
 Thaws the winter of our soul. Ode 49.

If he asks for his cup:

—Let me have a silver bowl,
 Where I may cradle all my soul. Ode 4.

If he would express the power of beauty:

Woman, be fair, we must adore thee;
 Smile, and a world is weak before thee! Ode 24.

Again:

From an eye of liquid blue
 A host of quivered Cupids flew. Ode 26.

The lips:

Posting nest of bland persuasion
 Ripely suing love's invasion. Ode 18.

We will now close our extracts with his description of Venus "on her first *emergence* from the waves," which we think a pretty fair specimen of his style in the translation of Anacreon.

Her bosom like the humid rose,
 Her neck like *dewy-sparkling snows*
 Illume the liquid path she traces,
 And burn within the stream's embraces.
 In liquid luxury soft she glides,
 Encircled by the azure tides,
 Like some fair lily faint with weeping
 Upon a bed of violets sleeping!
 Beneath the queen's inspiring glance
 The dolphins o'er the green sea dance,
 Bearing in triumph young Desire,
 And baby Love with smiles of fire.

Ode 57.

If any one supposes this to be Anacreon's manner, or that Anacreon is to be charged with any of these conceits, he is mistaken; for in selecting our examples we have been careful to take passages, which were not only bad poetry, but bad translations.

We cannot take our final leave of this work, until we have expressed our indignation at Mr. Moore's continual effort to make Anacreon even more gross than he really is. Whenever opportunities occur, and they occur but too often, he endeavours to give an air of indelicacy to the thought. We forbear to quote examples, for the same reason that we reprobate the practice. They may be found in almost every ode. We have no fear that we shall express ourselves too strongly on this subject. The charge is of too high a nature and the proof too obvious to require caution in our remarks. If no other reason could be given, its impurity alone is enough to condemn the book; but, as it has no value as a translation, and is besides written in a false taste, it is equally the interest of correct literature and sound morals to exclude it from the sphere of their influence.

In the course of our investigations we have been led to examine several other translations of Anacreon. Of these some were too literal and some too diffuse, but no one united the

spirit and luxurious softness of the original. We do not pretend to say, that this union can never be effected. Morality may perhaps be capable of demonstration to a mathematical certainty, and some individual more fortunate or more wise, than all the rest of the world, may discover the perpetual motion. Anacreon too may yet be domesticated in a modern idiom; but so long as every one, who attempts the task, meets only defeat and disgrace, we may be allowed to fear, that the probability of success is very remote, and join with La Harpe in his prophetic injunction, "*ne traduisons pas Anacréon.*"

FROM THE MEMOIRS OF MADAME DE STAAL.

[In Miss Edgeworth's delightful tale of *Ennui* some of our readers may recollect the following passage. It is part of a conversation between Lady Geraldine and Lord Glenthorn.

"My lord, did you ever happen to meet with *Les Memoires de Madame de Staal*?"

"No; I did not know that they were published.

"You mistake me: I mean *Madame de Staal of Louis the Fourteenth* and the regent's time, *Mademoiselle de Launay*.

"I never heard of such a person, and I blushed for my ignorance.

"Nay, I met with them myself only yesterday, said Lady Geraldine: I was struck with the character of the *Dutchess de la Ferté*, in which this kind of proud, patronising ignorance, is admirably painted from the life. It is really worth your while, my lord, to look at it. There's the book on that little table; here is the passage. You see this *Dutchess de la Ferté* is showing off to a sister dutchess, a poor girl of genius, like a puppet or an ape.

"Allons, mademoiselle, parlez—madame, vous allez voir comme elle parle. Elle vit que j'hesitois a repondre, et pensa qu'il falloit m'aider comme une chanteuse, qui prélude, a qui l'on indique l'air qu'on desire d'entendre—Parlez un peu de religion me dit elle, vous direz ensuite autre chose."

"This speech, Mr. Devereux tells me, has become quite proverbial in Paris, continued Lady Geraldine; and it is often quoted when any one presumes in the *Dutchess de la Ferté's* style."

What follows is a translation of a part of *Mademoiselle de Launay's* (*Madame de Staal's*) very lively account of her introduction to the Dutch-

* This is the passage marked with italics in the translation on the 119th page.

ess de la Ferté, and of the character of the Dutchess, and of her mode of patronage, from which account the passage above is quoted; She had through some circumstances, which she does not very clearly explain, become the *protégé* of the Abbess of the convent of St. Louis and of her sister. The Abbess dying, she came up to Paris almost destitute, to seek a place as a boarder in another convent. At Paris she fell sick, and with her convalescence the narrative which we give commences. She was afterward in the service of the Dutchess de la Main, and her Memoirs contain some information, conveyed in a very amusing style, respecting the intrigues and struggles, during the time of the Regency, concerning the right of succession to the throne, between the princes of the blood and the legitimated princes, at the head of whom was the Duke du Maine.]

DURING my recovery my sister came to see me, and informed me with great exultation of the good fortune, which she believed was about to fall to my lot. She told me, that while attending the Dutchess de la Ferté to Versailles, she had related to her on the way that she had a younger sister, who had been remarkably well educated in a provincial convent; she told her that I knew all that could possibly be known, and made an enumeration of the sciences (whose names she did not pronounce very correctly) which she pretended that I was acquainted with. My sister, who knew nothing herself, had no difficulty in believing, that I knew a great deal. The Dutchess, who was as ignorant as she, credited the whole, and was persuaded that I was a prodigy. She was the most enthusiastic person in the world. She arrived at Versailles, her mind full of this pretended wonder, which she spoke of wherever she went, particularly at her sister's, Madame de Ventadour's, where the Cardinal de Rohan was present. She heated her imagination in talking, and told an hundred times as much as had been told to her. Every body believed, such a treasure ought to be secured. The Dauphiness was still living. She was supposed to be with child; and it was thought, that, if she was delivered of a daughter, I might assist in its education. Meanwhile it was decided, that I must be sent to Jouarre to be with the Mesdemoiselles de Rohan, who were all three there, in order to make them so many *chef de œuvres*.

My sister, after having told me all this, said, that it was absolutely necessary, that I should go and make my acknowledg-

ments, and show myself to her mistress; that she would return to Versailles that day; and that after having paid my respects, I might come back immediately. I had no proper dress to present myself in. I borrowed one of a boarder of our convent for two or three hours, and after my sister had adjusted it a little, I sat out with her. We arrived at the Dutchess' as she was rising. She was delighted to see me, and charmed with my appearance. She had been so prepossessed, that it was impossible for it to be otherwise. After she had spoken a few words to me, and I had made her some very simple, and perhaps rather flat replies; In truth, said she, she talks wonderfully well, she has come just when wanted, to write me a letter to M. Desmarets, which I wish him to receive immediately. Come, Mademoiselle, you shall have paper directly, you have only to write—To write what, Madame? said I, very much embarrassed. You may put it into what language you will, answered she, it must be correct. I wish him to grant me what I request. But Madame, I replied, it is necessary to know what you wish to say to him. Oh no; you understand. I understood nothing at all. It was in vain for me to insist, I could not make her explain herself. At last putting together the disconnected hints, which she gave, I in some degree comprehended the business in hand. I had made but little progress; for I was not acquainted with the usages and ceremonies of people of quality, and I saw very well that she would not distinguish an error of ignorance from a want of good sense. I however took the paper, which was brought me, and sat down to write, whilst she was rising, without knowing how I should succeed; and writing entirely at hazard, I finished the letter, which I presented to her, very uncertain of its success. Very well, she exclaimed, it is precisely what I wanted to say to him. But this is admirable, that she has seized my idea so well. —Henrietta, your sister astonishes me. Oh, since she writes so well, she must write me another letter for my steward:—that shall be done while I dress myself. There was now no necessity of asking her any questions respecting what she wanted to have written. She poured forth a torrent of words, that with all my attention I could not follow, and I found myself still more em-

barrassed at this second trial, than at the preceding. She had named her attorney and her lawyer, who were to be repeatedly mentioned in this letter. They were entirely unknown to me, and unfortunately I took the name of the one for that of the other. The business is very well explained, said she to me, after having read the letter, but I do not comprehend how a girl, who has so much understanding as you have, could give my lawyer the name of my attorney. She discovered by that the limits of my genius. Fortunately I did not entirely lose her esteem.

Whilst I was completing all these dispatches, she had finished her toilet, and thought of nothing but setting out for Versailles. I followed her to her carriage, and when she was seated, and my sister, whom she carried with her, had taken her place, at the moment when the door was shutting, and I began to breathe freely, I think, said she to my sister, that I shall do well to carry her immediately with me. Get in, get in, *Mademoiselle*; I wish to introduce you to *Madame de Ventadour*. I was petrified at this proposal. But what more than all made my heart sink, was the dress, which I had borrowed for two hours, and in which I feared they would oblige me to make the tour of the world; and I was not much mistaken. But notwithstanding these considerations, there was no means of retreat. It was no longer in my power to have a will of my own, nor to resist that of others. I got in therefore with a heavy heart. She did not perceive it, and talked the whole of the way. She said a hundred things at once, which had no relation to each other. At the same time there was so much vivacity, nature, and grace in her conversation, that one heard her with great pleasure. After having asked me many questions without waiting for any answer; Undoubtedly, said she, since you know so many things, you know how to cast a figure to draw an horoscope. Astrology is the thing I am the most attached to in the world. I told her that I had not the least acquaintance with this science. To what purpose then, said she, have you learnt so many others, which are of no service. I assured her, that I had not learnt any; but she was no longer listening to me; and began making an eulogy on geoman-

ey, chiromancy, &c. told me all the predictions, which had been made to her, whose fulfilment she was still expecting, and related to me many memorable stories on this subject, and finally her dream of the preceding night, together with a number of others sufficiently remarkable, which were sooner or later to have their accomplishment. I heard her with a great deal of respect, and very little credulity. At last we arrived; she told my sister and me to go to her apartment, and afterward to come and inquire for her at Madame de Ventadour's, where she was to be set down. Her lodgings at Versailles were in the upper chambers of the palace. It was impossible for me to get to the top of the stair-case, and if one of her servants, who had followed us, had not carried me the latter part of the way, I should have been obliged to remain where I was. This fatigue threw me into a state of weakness and insensibility, in which I had scarce any feeling or thought left. I had not well understood, what the dutchess had said to us, with regard to my being presented to Madame de Ventadour. My sister had understood it no better, and I believed we were to remain where we were till she sent for us. We continued accordingly till night in her apartment, when she came back in a violent passion, because we had not complied with her orders. They had not been clearly explained, but this was not an excuse to be offered to her. She had intended that we should come to her; it had not been done; and my fortune was gone forever. I heard in respectful silence her regrets, her reproaches, and all that her impetuous and unrestrained feelings made her utter. When she had exhausted herself, she grew calm, and thought only on the morrow. She said she would carry me herself to her sister, and she did carry me there. I found a person of a character very different from her own. The softness and serenity of her countenance discovered the calmness of her temper and the evenness of her mind. She received me with the greatest goodness and politeness, spoke to me of my mother, who had been the governess of her daughter, of the esteem which she had for her, of the good report she had heard of me, and lastly of her desire to place me in some agreeable situation. Afterward I was made to see the Duke of Brittany, who was still

living, and the king, who did little more than exist. They said that I must also see the beauties of Versailles, and they carried me every where. I thought I should have died with fatigue.

The Dutchess de la Ferté had already talked so much about me, that I was observed as an object of curiosity; and a thousand people came to look at me, to examine me, and to question me. She was still desirous that I should finish the day by being present at the king's supper. And after having distinguished me in the crowd, she pointed me out to the Duke of Burgundy, whom she entertained during part of the supper with an account of my talents and my pretended knowledge. The next day being about to visit the Dutchess de Noailles, she directed me to come there. There, said she, Madame, is this person, of whom I have conversed with you, who has such great talents, and who knows so much. *Come on, Mademoiselle, speak. Madame, you shall hear how she talks. She saw that I hesitated, and thought it was necessary to assist me, like a person preparing to sing, to whom one mentions the air he is desirous of hearing. Talk a little about religion, said she to me, you shall talk afterward about something else.* I was more confounded than I can express; and I do not even remember how I extricated myself. It was without doubt by denying the talents, which she attributed to me.

This ridiculous scene was very nearly repeated in other places where I was carried. I then saw that I was led about like an ape, or like some other animal that is made a show of at a fair. I preferred that the earth should swallow me up, rather than continue in this character. I have perhaps to reproach myself for having been so much disgusted, and for having had less regard than I ought, to the motive of so many strange proceedings, which was no other than an immoderate desire to increase my reputation.

* * * * *

The Dutchess de la Ferté returned at last to Paris, and brought me back to my convent, to my great satisfaction. She caressed me a thousand times, when taking leave, and assured

me that if my business was not finished immediately, she would take other measures, and that however things might turn, it would not be long before I should see her again.

ANALECTA.

Inest sua gratia parva.

FROM MRS. RADCLIFFE'S JOURNEY THROUGH GERMANY.

THERE is good sense and knowledge of human nature in the following remark of Mrs. Radcliffe, from her *Journey through Holland and Germany*.

“To be thought capable of commanding more pleasures and preventing more inconveniences than others, is a too general passport; and in ordinary affairs of life, for one that will show somewhat less prosperity than he has, in order to try who will really respect him, thousands exert themselves to assume an appearance of more, which they might know can procure only the mockery of esteem for themselves, and the reality of it for their supposed conditions. Authors are not always free from a willingness to receive the fallacious sort of respect, that attaches to accidental circumstances, for the real sort, of which it would be more reasonable to be proud. A man relating part of the history of his life, which is always necessarily done by a writer of travels, does not choose to shew that his course could be through any scenes deficient of delights; or if it were, that he was not enough elevated by his friends, importance, fortune, fame, or business, to be incapable of observing them minutely. The curiosities of cabinets and courts are therefore exactly described, and as much of every occurrence, as does not shew the relater moving in any of the plainer walks of life; but the difference between the stock of physical comforts in different countries, the character of conditions, if the phrase may be used, such as it appears in the ordinary circumstances of residence, dress, food, cleanliness, opportunities of relaxation, in short, the information which all may gain, is

sometimes left to be gained by all, not from the book, but from travel. A writer issuing into the world makes up, what he mistakes for his best appearance, and is continually telling his happiness, or shewing his good-humour; as people in a promenade always smile, and always look round to observe whether they are seen smiling. The politest salutation of a Chinese, when they meet, is, "Sir, prosperity is painted on your countenance;" or, "your whole air announces your felicity;" and the writers of travels, especially since the censure, thrown upon Smollet, seem to provide, that their prosperity shall be painted on their volumes; and all their observations announce their felicity."

There is something striking also in the following passage from the same work:—

"We were shown through her apartments, [those of the Archdutchess Maria Christiana, sister of the last queen of France,] which she had left for Goodesberg a few hours before. On the table of her sitting room lay the fragments of a painted cross, composed of small pieces, like our dissected maps, the putting of which together exercises ingenuity and passes perhaps for a sort of piety. The attendant said, that it served to pass the time; but it cannot be supposed, that rank and fortune have so little power to bestow happiness, as that their possessors should have recourse to such means of lightening the hours of life."

There are various passages in this 'Journey,' which will remind one of her powers of description in her romances; one of these is the following:—

"On returning from an excursion of this kind at the close of evening, the soldiers at the gates [of Manheim] are frequently heard chanting martial songs in parts and chorus: a sonorous music in severe unison with the solemnity of the hour, and the imperfect forms, that meet the eye, of sentinels keeping watch beneath the dusky gateways, while their brethren, reposing on the benches without, mingle their voices in deep chorus. Rude and simple as are these strains, they are often singularly impressive and touch the imagination with something approach-

ing to horror, when the circumstances of the place are remembered, and it is considered, how soon these men, sent to inflict death on others, may themselves be thrown into the unnumbered heap of the military slain."

FRENCH LITERATURE

EVERY reader of Marmontel's memoirs may recollect what a softening and what a glow he casts over the characters and manners, with which he was familiar; with what an entire want of feeling or apparent consciousness of harm he speaks of the violations of good morals, and with what innocent profligates and amiable scoundrels he seems to have been connected. One may recollect also the impression, which he gives of the delights of a Parisian *conversazione*. Charmed, as one is by the fascination of the style and manner, in which his memoirs are written, we consider the representations they contain of scenes and characters to be about as true to fact and reality, as those in his "Moral Tales" are to nature and real life. We will give from one, who was not from character or principle disposed to be prejudiced against the men, of whom he speaks, his remarks upon the same class of persons, which Marmontel brings to our view:—

"I admire," says Horace Walpole, "Voltaire and Helvetius. Rousseau I could never like. Take much affectation, and a little spice of frenzy, and you compose his personal character. I found the French philosophers so impudent, dogmatic, and intrusive, that I detested their conversation. Of all kinds of vice I hate reasoning vice. Unprincipled themselves, they affected to dictate morality and sentiment. The great, from vain glory and want of ideas, encouraged their presence; but they always reminded me of the sophists, hired to assist at Roman entertainments. And what reasoning! Every Frenchman ought to be taught logic and mathematics, that his mind may acquire some solidity. Their character is so impetuous, that what with us is sensation, with them is passion. The real philosophers of antiquity were distinguished for their moderation, a radical mark of knowledge, and wisdom; and they treat-

ed the popular religion with respect. Our new sect are fanatics against religion, and surely of all human characters a fanatic philosopher is the most incongruous, and consequently the most ridiculous."

MADAME DE STAAL.

THE Baroness de Staal (from whose memoirs we have already given an extract) thus speaks of one of her friends:—

"I discovered," she says, "by slight proofs, some diminution of his attachment. I used often to visit the Mesdemoiselles d' Epinay, at whose house he almost always was. As they lived very near my convent, I commonly returned on foot, and he never failed to be my attendant. There was a great square to be passed on our way home, and at the beginning of our acquaintance he used to choose our way by the sides of it. I remarked afterwards that he crossed it, from whence I judged that his regard was at least diminished, by the difference of the diagonal from the two sides of a square."

"The best method," says Madame de Staal, "of relieving disquietude of mind, is not by combating the object, which is the cause of it, but by presenting others to the mind, that may draw away its attention, and insensibly remove it from this object."

We think the following little narration, in which she speaks of the Marquis de Silly, concludes with one of the most delicate compliments we have ever met with.

"I felt sensibly his power of pleasing, and his neglect of attention. His sister, who had seen him more sociable, was not less hurt than myself. It was the common subject of our conversations. One day, when we were walking in a wood, when we believed ourselves alone, we expressed without reserve, how much we were offended with him. He was sufficiently near us to overhear what we were saying, without our perceiving him, and finding that we were talking of him, he stopped to listen. We were seated; he hid himself behind some trees, and lost no part of our conversation. It expressed

various passions. He found it worthy of attention, and perceived that we had reason to complain of a neglect, which we had not merited. He did not discover himself. But when we were returning to the chateau, he met us, and observed that he had overheard conversation about himself, that much evil had been said of him, and that it was not said laughingly. "One has no disposition to laugh," I replied, "in complaining of you:"—The artlessness of this answer pleased him.—"

In the following passage she describes that disposition, which is so common, to think we have expressed any strong feeling, even when we can recollect no marks of its expression. Speaking of a letter, in which she replied to one of the Marquis de Silly—

"I wish I had the answer, which I sent. There was nothing in it more, than in his letter; but it seemed to me, that it contained more, and that there was, as it were, between the lines, something not expressed by any words."

It seems that the observation, which Dr. Franklin somewhere relates, or which it is said he used to relate, as having been made by one of two French ladies, who were sisters, was in fact made by the Dutchess de la Ferté.

"It is true," says Madame de Staal, "that I did not regain her tenderness, but I saw her, and she treated me with kindness and familiarity. It was after my return to her favor, that she said to me one day, 'There my child, I see nobody but myself who is always in the right.'"

The following character is drawn with spirit, and in the style of these Memoirs.

"The first President, [M. de Mesmes,] was to appearance, entirely devoted to the house of Maine. But little assistance, however, was derived from him. He was a great courtier, a man of moderate talents, of an agreeable turn of mind, and pleasant manners, weak, timid, abounding in those faults, which assist one in pleasing, and hinder one from being of service."

FRENCH WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

It is remarkable that the principle, on which the French have lately regulated their weights and measures, was anticipated and proposed by old Robert Burton. In his *Anatomy of Melancholy*, he describes a commonwealth after his own heart.

"I will yet," he says, "to satisfy and please myself, make an Utopia of mine own, a new Atlantis, a poetical commonwealth of mine own, in which I will freely domineer, build cities, make laws, statutes, as I list myself."

In this commonwealth he declares—

"I will have no private monopolies to enrich one man, and beggar a multitude, multiplicity of offices, of supplying by deputies, weights and measures the same throughout, and those rectified by the *Primum Mobile*, and the sun's motion, three-score miles to a degree according to observation, 1000 geometrical paces to a mile, five feet to a pace, twelve inches to a foot, &c. and from measures known it is an easy matter to rectify weights, &c, to cast up all, and resolve bodies by Algebra, Stereometry. [p. 97, last edit.]

CONVEX LENSES AMONG THE ANCIENTS.

The following letter is extracted from the *Washingtonian*, a respectable paper, published at Windsor, in Vermont.

"Copy of a letter from the Hon. Nathaniel Chipman, Esq. to the Rev. Samuel Williams, LL. D. a professor in the College at Burlington, dated Nov. 26, 1810.

"DEAR SIR,

"IN a conversation which we had, not long since, concerning the discoveries made by the ancients, I observed to you, that from an imperfect recollection of a passage in *Aristophanes*, it was my belief, they were acquainted with the powers of the Lens, as a burning glass. In this I am fully confirmed by the examination of the passage. It is in the "*Comedy of the Clouds*," Act 2d, scene 1st. *Strepsiades* is represented as having entered himself a student of *Sophistry* with *Socrates*,

with a view of learning some art, by which he might defraud his creditors of their demands. These were debts on bond. It will be recollected, that writings were, at that time, principally on thin tablets of wood, smeared over with wax. Socrates directs his pupil to devise and propose methods of evasion.

"Strepsiades, after having proposed several things, which were deemed not satisfactory, says—

"*Strep.* 'I have now discovered a method by obliteration, which, you will own, is very ingenious.'

"*Soc.* 'What is it?'

"*Strep.* 'You have seen at the apothecaries' that beautiful, transparent stone, with which they light fire.' [*Πυρ ἀπτεται.*]

"*Soc.* 'You would say glass.' [*την ὀψλον.*]

"*Strep.* 'Right.'

"*Soc.* 'And what would you do with that?'

"*Strep.* 'I will take this glass, and while the Scribe is entering judgment, I will stand at a little distance towards the sun,* and melt the writing, or letters of my bond.'

"I have given a literal translation of the passage. From this it is evident, that the burning glass, or lens, was well known at that time in Athens. The 'Comedy of the Clouds' is supposed to have been written at the beginning of the 98th Olympiad, the year of Rome (A. U.) 329 or 330; about 450 years before the Christian æra.

"I am, &c. N. CHIPMAN.

"S. WILLIAMS, LL. D."

On the passage above quoted, one scholiast upon Aristophanes remarks: "What is spoken of, is a thing formed of glass, [or rather crystal] in the shape of a wheel, (*τροχαυδι*,) thick, and made for this purpose, which being anointed with oil, and heated, a match is brought, and so lighted. This then is what he, (Strepsiades) says. 'If I can light the instrument, which the 'scribe is' writing, with this glass, and so get it on fire, I shall 'destroy the writing of the bond.' As there is some obscurity about this, we shall give the original.

766. *την ὀψλον λεγεις;* Κατασκευασμα εστιν ὀψλον τροχαυδης, παχυν, κα

* The courts at Athens were held in the open air.

τοῦτο τεχθῆναι, ὅτι ἐλαιῷ χρίοντες καὶ θριμμαίνοντες, προσαύξει θρυαλλίδα, καὶ οὕτως ἄπτυσσι. Τὸτο οὖν φησιν, ἡ υφ'αΐσκει διὰ τὴν ὕαλην, καὶ προσαύγει μὴ τὴν δαλτὴν τὸ πῦρ τῇ τῇ γραμμῇ, ἀφανίσαιμι τὰ γραμμὰτα τῆς διῶς.

From the anointing with oil mentioned, it would seem, that the thing spoken of by Aristophanes, if the scholiast understood him correctly, could not be a convex lens. Nor do we know any thing, which throws light upon this circumstance, except a remark we have met with in the Encyclopedia (Art. *Glass*), in which, speaking of a plate of glass found at Herculaneum, it is said: "Such plates he [Mr. Nixon] supposes might serve for *specula*, or looking glasses; for Pliny, in speaking of Sidon, adds; *siquidem etiam specula excogitaverat*: the reflection of images from the ancient specula being effected by *besmearing them behind*, or tinging them through with some dark colour."

Kuster however in his note on this passage of Aristophanes understands what is spoken of to be a burning lens. He says, "What is meant, is a stone, crystal, [Brunck likewise in his translation renders ὕαλην, crystallum,] with which being held to the sun, the ancients were accustomed to light fire, as we learn from Orpheus [*περὶ λίθων*, cap. *περὶ κρυστάλλων*.] And Pliny [Lib. xxxvii. cap. 2.] says, that there were some physicians 'who thought, that there was no better mode of cauterising those parts of the body, which required it, than by a crystal ball, placed opposite to the rays of the sun.' At the present day [1710] those glasses, which are commonly called burning glasses, are used for the same purpose, [*eundem usum præbent*.]"

The passage referred to by Kuster in the poem on precious stones attributed to Orpheus, is as follows:

Εἰ γὰρ ἀπὲρ κρῆτιρος θύλιος πῦρος ἐς φλόγας ὀρταί,
Κυκλοῦμαι ἀναλίσσει μιν ὑπὲρ δαίδων καταβυναί.
Αὐτὰρ ὅγ' ἡλίοιο καταρτίων συγχαζόντες
Αὐτὶχ' ὑπὲρ δαίδων ὀλίγην ἀκτῖνα ταῦσσι.
Ἦδ' ὅτι κεφαλῆς τι θύγῃ καὶ πίοις ὕλης
Καπνοὶ, ἵστα γὰρ πῦρ ὀλίγον, μετὰ δὲ φλόγα πολλήν
Ὀρταί.

The above translated is as follows. "But if you wish to excite flame without brisk fire, you may place it [the crystal] above dry torches, then that, the sun shining opposite, (κατα-

tion,) will immediately shed a small ray upon the torches, which, as soon as it touches the dry and combustible matter, will excite, first smoke, then a little fire, and then a great flame." The author adds, that he "hopes no fire is more agreeable than this to the immortal gods for the burning of their sacrifices."

It would seem that what is here referred to, is a burning lens, as Kuster supposes, but Dr. Priestley in his life of Orpheus [period 1.] says: "It is probable that the Romans had a method of lighting their sacred fire by means of *reflecting concave speculums*." He observes however, immediately preceding, that, "it appears from a circumstance in the history of Socrates, [we do not know to what circumstance he refers,] that the effects of *burning glasses* had also been observed by the ancients." He observes likewise, "That the power of transparent bodies in a spherical form, &c. in magnifying or burning, was not wholly unknown to the ancients, is further probable from certain gems preserved in the cabinets of the curious, and which are supposed to have belonged to the Druids."

The effect of a glass globe, filled with water, in magnifying, was likewise, as he mentions, observed by the ancients. For this he appeals to Seneca, and adds, that "the ancient engravers of gems, are supposed to have made use of such a globe in magnifying their figures."

We may add, that the power of such a globe, in producing heat, was also noticed by the ancients. Pliny b. 36. c. 16, says, "That glass globes, being filled with water, and placed opposite to the sun, will cause so much heat, as to burn cloathes." And Lactantius, as quoted by Harduin, in his note on this passage of Pliny, remarks, (Liber de Ira. Dei. cap. 10.) "If a glass globe, filled with water, be held in the sun, a flame may be kindled by the light, which comes from the water, even in the coldest weather."

To return to convex lenses, there appears both from the passage quoted by Judge Chipman and from the others, we have produced, to be on the whole no doubt, that the ancients were acquainted with them, and with their use in burning. They seem however to have been commonly not of glass, but of crystal.

POETRY.

EPISTLE OF HORACE TO JULIUS FLORUS.

HOR. EP. 2. LIB. 2.

FLORUS, the illustrious Nero's* faithful friend,
 What if some one, who wished a slave to vend,
 Should thus with you about the purchase treat:—
 "He's a fine lad, from head to foot complete;
 "Eight thousand sesterces, and he's your own;
 "Quick at a nod, at once your will is done;
 "Talks Greek, learns any thing you wish with ease,
 "Just like moist clay, you'll mould him, as you please,
 "Then he's a singer too, his voice so fine,
 "Tho' all unttaught, will charm you o'er your wine.
 "But why this praise; 'tis but the common tale
 "Of pedlars, seeking for their wares a sale.
 "I under no necessity am laid,
 "And though not rich, yet all my debts are paid.
 "No dealer'd put him to you half so low,
 "And 'tis not every one, should have him so.
 "I own that once he made a trifling slip,
 "And hid himself, as usual, from the whip.
 "That he wont run away I dont pretend;
 "In all things else Ill warrant and defend."
 If then, with open eyes, you buy the slave,
 It seems to me, that you can fairly have
 No claim for damages; ygt you dispute,
 And vex the seller with a tedious suit.

All blame, before you left me, to prevent,
 I told you I was dull and indolent.
 Yet say, of what avail was this to me,
 If still you murmur at so just a plea;
 Nay more, complain, because I did not send
 Th' expected poems, I've deceived my friend.

One of Lucullus' soldiers, as 'tis said,
 By service hard a little sum had made.
 One night, as weary, fast asleep he lay,
 Some pilfering scoundrel stole the whole away.
 He, with himself and foes alike enraged,
 Fierce as an hungry wolf in fight engaged,
 Dislodged a garrison well fortified,
 And took the place with richest stores supplied.

* Tiberius, the successor of Augustus, one of whose names was Nero.

The man, praised loudly for a feat so bold,
 Received beside a good round sum in gold.
 About this time, ('twas dangerous to perform,)
 The Prætor wished a certain fort to storm.
 When thus the daring hero he addressed,
 In words, that might have fired a coward's breast:—
 "Go, go, my friend, where valor leads the way,
 "And large rewards shall your deserts repay;
 "Go, and may vict'ry on your footsteps wait;
 "Astonishment! and do you hesitate!"
 Whom the shrewd rustic drily answer'd thus:—
 "He, he will go, who's lately lost his purse."

Brought up at Rome, it chanced I there was taught
 What ills on Greece Achilles' anger brought.
 Athens, the seat of ev'ry art refined,
 Then gave a little polish to my mind;
 Taught me geometry, and bid me rove,
 In search of truth, through Academus' grove.
 But ah, unhappy times soon called me far
 From these sweet scenes; the rage of civil war
 Drove me unskilled to arms, that strove in vain,
 Th' unequal fight 'gainst Cæsar to maintain.
 But when Philippi clipt my soaring pride,
 And sent me home, with ruin by my side,
 Compelled by want, I tried to court the muse;
 But now, when blest with more than I can use,
 What dose would cure a madness so absurd,
 Unless my ease to writing I preferred?

The years, revolving steal from us our powers,
 My jests, loves, sports, my taste for festive hours
 They've torn away; and now my poems too
 They strive to wrest. What would you have me do?
 In fine, with various humors men admire;
 You love the measure suited to the lyre;
 He most is pleased with th' Iambic strain;
 A third delights in Bion's bitter vein.
 Thus I've three guests of different tastes to dine,
 How shall I suit you? That, which you decline,
 Another calls for; and, what pleases you,
 Is sour and odious to the other two.

Beside, mid all the cares and toils of Rome,
 Can I write verses? One entreats I'd come,
 And be his bail; another humbly prays,
 Business I'd quit, and listen to his lays.
 And, though they live at different ends of town;
 (A special distance, you must surely own,)

Both must I see. "Still in the streets there's nought,
 "That as you walk need interrupt a thought."

Here drives a buikler with his busy throng
 Of mules and postars; there an engine strong
 Heaves a vast stone or beam; in sad array,
 Funerals contend with waggons for the way.
 Next a mad dog, or sniry pig you meet;
 Now go, compose me verses in the street.
 Votaries of Bacchus, poets ever love
 To shun the crowd, and court the shady grove.
 In such a din can I then hail the muse,
 Or trace the path of beauty, she pursues!

Even at Athens, calm as it appears,
 A genius who has studied seven long years,
 If through the streets, with books and cares grown grey,
 Profoundly lost in thought, he bend his way;
 Mute as a statue, as he walks along,
 He shakes with laughter all the gathering throng.
 Shall I then, midst this ocean of affairs,
 This very storm of business and of cares,
 To modulate harmonious strains aspire,
 And suit their measure to the sounding lyre?

Two brothers, one for rhetoric renowned,
 The other in the wiles of law profound,
 Conspired at Rome by unremitting praise,
 In every speech each other's fame to raise;
 The one, a perfect Mutius to the other,
 And he, in turn, a Gracchus to his brother.
 An equal folly fires the poet's brain,
 I strike the lyre, soft elegy his strain.
 What wond'rous genius glows in every line!
 'Twas surely polished by the tuneful nine.
 Now mark with what parade and pride we claim
 Apollo's temple to enshrine our fame,
 Then following after learn, if time allows,
 Why we the wreaths intwine around our brows.
 Like Samnites,* who engage by candle light,
 We deal alternate blows in harmless fight.
 In his opinion I, Alcæus shine,
 And he, at least Callimachus in mine.
 If more than this his high ambition claim,
 I swell his pride with great Minnermus' name.
 Thus while I court the public with my muse,
 To soothe each rival every art I use;
 My studies done, my rhyming phrensy o'er,
 Against the scribbling tribe I shut my door.

* One kind of gladiators.

Bad poets are to all a standing jest;
 And yet they write with self-complacence blest;
 Admire the gingle of their senseless lays,
 And if you're silent, e'en themselves will praise.
 He, who from every fault his piece would free,
 Must on himself a rigid critic be.
 Such terms, as but with little splendor shine,
 Such as enfeeble, or degrade the line,
 He from his poem boldly will erase,
 Howe'er reluctant they may quit their place;
 From uncouth phrase, and long oblivion take
 Words, our old Catos and Cethegi spake;
 To these new terms of sanctioned usage join,
 And ancient force with modern grace combine.
 Flowing and full he'll pour his verse along,
 And Latium bless with a rich tide of song;
 Polish the rough, th' exuberant confine,
 And blot the unmeaning; till the perfect line,
 Wrought by laborious patience into ease,
 By graceful negligence shall seem to please:
 Just as the dancer, trained by toilsome art,
 Now plays the Satyr's, now the Cyclop's part.

Stupid I'd rather be, a thousand times,
 While still delighted with my own dull rhymes,
 Than, cursed with finer taste, forever be
 Tortured to mend the many faults I see.
 An Argian once, of no mean name, deceived
 By a strange frenzy of his brain, believed,
 While in the empty theatre, he heard
 Fine tragedies, and all delight appeared.
 And still, in other things, was sound of mind,
 A worthy neighbour, as a husband kind,
 A master not severe, enough of wit,
 To shun a precipice or open pit.
 His friends to cure him every mean explored,
 And hellebore at length his wits restored.
 Come to himself, "By heavens, my friends," he cried,
 "Is this to cure? 'Twere better I had died,
 "Than thus to lose by your officious love,
 "Those sweet illusions, that my fancy wove.

'Tis wisdom then no longer to engage
 In trifles suited to a younger age;
 No more the concord of sweet sounds to swell,
 But learn the harmony of living well;
 Thus then I oft commune with my own mind;
 If, from repeated draughts, you could not find

The burning fever of your thirst allayed,
 You'd tell your doctor, and implore his aid;
 But when, the more you gain, you crave the more,
 Say is there none, whose aid you dare implore?
 You'd throw aside prescriptions, that you found
 Of no avail, to soothe an aching wound.
 Perchance some one has told you, folly flies
 The man, whom Jove with stores of wealth supplies;
 But when with added treasures you receive
 No added wisdom, will you still believe?
 If gold with prudence could your breast inspire,
 Could calm anxiety, subdue desire;
 Well might you blush, if in the search of self
 One lived on earth, more eager than yourself.

If that is ours, for which our gold we pay,
 And use gives property, as lawyers say;
 That field is yours, whose fruits supply your board,
 And Orbius' steward owns you as his lord.
 You give him money, and receive its worth,
 In wine, grapes, eggs, in pullets, and so forth;
 Thus by degrees a farm you may possess,
 Bought at three hundred pieces, more or less.
 The same, whether at once the fee you buy,
 Or daily what may each day's wants supply.
 Thus he, who long since paid the purchase down
 Of all the lands, he fondly calls his own,
 The fruits that feed him, and the wood that warms,
 Still buys, though proudly boasting of his farms;
 As if to any here belonged the power
 To call his own, that which each fleeting hour,
 Sold, giv'n, or torn by force, or death away,
 May change its owner, and new lords obey.
 If then earth's strongest tenure is so frail;
 What can your houses, what your stores avail?
 Why add, with anxious labor, field to field?
 Will death, subdued by gold, to bribery yield?
 Heir treads on heir, as wave rolls over wave,
 And all distinction's levelled in the grave.

Gems, Tuscan statues, marble, ivory,
 Plate, paintings, vests of rich Getulian dye,
 Though these the objects, most with ardor crave,
 There are, who have not, nor desire to have.
 Why of two brothers, one more dearly loves
 Perfumes, ease, pleasures, than all Herod's groves;
 Though rich, the other with incessant toil
 Early and late, labors to tame his soil;

That Genius knows, who rules our natal star,
Fashions our tempers, makes us what we are,
Bids, at his pleasure, still new humors rise,
Lives in our life, and only with us dies.

Careless of what a thankless heir may say
My little store shall bless the passing day.
Yet the distinction shall in me be seen
The social, open hearted man between,
And prodigal; the frugal, and the mean,
For wide the difference is, to waste profuse
The wealth you want the wit to turn to use;
And without grudging to enjoy your store,
Nor meanly pinch yourself, to make it more,
But, as a boy, the fleeting holiday,
To seize each moment, as it wings its way.

Avert, ye gods, forever from my door
Those loathsome miseries, that haunt the poor.
If I'm unchanged, 'tis all the same to me,
If boat or barge convey me o'er life's sea.
What, though the north wind rarely swell our sails,
We do not always buffet southern gales,
Last of the first, first of the last, in health,
In genius, beauty, virtue, birth, and wealth.

You say you're free from av'rice; grant it true,
Have all your other vices fled you too?
Does vain ambition never swell your breast;
No rage, no fear of death, disturb your rest?
Smile you at witches, prodigies, and dreams,
And ghosts, that vex the midnight air with screams?
Can you, on each returning natal day,
With grateful calm your added years survey?
Do you the errors of your friends forgive,
And as you longer, better learn to live;
As age approaches, do your passions cease,
And mildest feelings soothe your soul to peace?
What boots it to extract a single thorn,
If by so many still your breast be torn?
If ignorant to act, resign your part
To those, who'll play it with more taste and art.
You've sported, eat, and drank enough; now quit
The table, sober; lest the taunting wit
Of sportive youth, with better grace absurd,
Should jeer, and drive you reeling from the board.

REVIEW.

Nec vero hæ sine sorte datæ, sine judice, sedes.—VINE.

ARTICLE 1.

Sermons on various subjects, by Henry Kollock, D.D. pastor of the first Presbyterian church in Savannah. Savannah, Seymour & Williams, 1811, 8vo.

THE sermons of Dr. Kollock are written in imitation of the French style of pulpit eloquence, and of course intended to produce at least an immediate effect. He has formed himself so much on the model of the French preachers, that he has generally followed them in their artificial mode of laying out the subject of a sermon, so as to have but two principal divisions. He has prefixed a short preface, in which he states, that these sermons were written without any thought of publication, that they were printed amid a pressure of parochial occupations, which almost prevented even a revision of them, and that he fully perceives their numberless defects. He concludes with the following sentence: "Reader, instead of criticising, unite with me in praying, that these discourses may be blessed to your soul and mine." We shall pay all regard to these apologies, and remark on no faults, for which haste can well be offered as an excuse.

These sermons will be very popular with a certain class of readers. They are, beside the characteristic before mentioned, of the highest rank of those, technically called evangelical. They regard all mankind as divided into two classes, which do not pass into each other by insensible gradation, but are perfectly distinct; differing very much in number as well as all other respects. These are the converted and unconverted. The converted are very few.

"How small," says Dr. Kollock, "is the number of the children of God. Look around you: how many do you observe, who, instead of regarding the world as an enemy, &c. . . . All these, we are assured by the unerring oracles of truth, shall never enter the kingdom of heaven: and do not these compose the greater part of our unhappy race?" p. 168, 169. "What a lamentable reflection is this," to quote another exclamation on the subject, "and what an heart must he have, who can think of it without emotion. There are but few persons, who love the Saviour: that is to say, almost all mankind are guilty of monstrous ingratitude, are blind to true excellence, are going thoughtlessly to perdition; that is to say, the prince of darkness rules upon earth, and is drawing down millions to his dreary habitation." p. 266.

The converted, as may be inferred from these extracts, are quite different from the rest of mankind. They have (as it is expressed in these sermons) new tastes, relishes, and inclinations, loving what they once hated, and hating what they once loved.* Other men may regard God as their Father and Friend, with love, gratitude, and reverence; but this proceeds from a lamentable ignorance of his true character, and they alone have the right sort of feelings toward him, founded upon a correct comprehension of his nature and perfections. Other men may view Jesus Christ as the messenger of God, and the Saviour of the world; but they alone are united to him in a mystical union, and feel "a longing for his presence, which is necessarily accompanied with a delight in his society, and a grief for his absence."† Other men may be earnestly endeavouring to do good and avoid evil; they may even be so, or at least think they are so, from obedience to the will of God, from a sense of duty, from a regard to their own best interest, or from benevolent affections; they may make "painful exertions" and "severe struggles against the world," but they are still "its slaves, and shall perish with it."‡ They are "actuated only by natural principles;"§ their virtue is not of the right kind: heaven shall vanish from their eyes; (as is described in these sermons;) hell gape to receive them; their shrieks shall vibrate on the ears of the redeemed as they rise with their Saviour to glory; and the smoke of their torments ascend for ever and ever.

* See p. 271.

† p. 281.

‡ See p. 168.

er.* The goodness of the converted is quite another sort of goodness from that of the rest of mankind. They have new feelings, joys, and motives, which cannot be described in any language intelligible to the unconverted; because these latter can have no more conception of them, than animals, with but four senses, can conceive the ideas of the fifth. With great joys they have likewise great troubles; for the world is at enmity with them, and they are at enmity with the world. It is not with their virtues, as with those of common men, which usually procure their possessors love and respect. They, on the contrary, are persecuted and despised, and every body takes pleasure in doing them mischief, on account of their preternatural goodness.

"The world," says Dr. Kollock, "assaults the believer by its persecution and rage, by its injuries and scoffs." p. 163. "How many," he exclaims, "whose good resolutions have been shaken by the mockeries and insults, with which libertines have treated the pious; by the malignant and diabolical pleasure, with which they have seized upon the smallest failings of the believer, and held them up with bitter scorn and wicked exaggerations to the public gaze?" p. 164.

Such is the character of the converted, as it appears in these sermons. We do not mean to imply, that the word may not be very properly used in a different sense.

There are eighteen of these sermons, on the following subjects.

- I. & II. Christian education.
- III. Early piety.
- IV. Jesus weeping over Jerusalem.
- V. Jesus leaving peace to his disciples.
- VI. The agony of Jesus.
- VII. The crucifixion—a sacramental discourse.
- VIII. The Christian's victory over the world.
- IX. Ministry of angels.
- X. Life of Adam.
- XI. Cain and Abel.
- XII. Heaven.
- XIII. Love to the Saviour.
- XIV. Remembrance of the love of Christ—a sacramental discourse.
- XV. The Lord our Shepherd.

* See p. 381.

XVI. Abraham offering up Isaac.

XVII. The sinner his own destroyer.

XVIII. Last judgment.

One of the first characteristics, which may strike a reader of these sermons, is their severity and gloominess; we had almost said their harshness and ferocity. In almost every discourse there is some mention of hell as a place of material fire and bodily torment. We have no doubt, that a preacher ought frequently to display to his hearers the natural connexion between sin and misery; that he ought frequently to remind them, that the most awful effects of this connexion are not felt in the present life, and that he should occasionally even use that kind of language on this subject, which may have the greatest effect on the lowest class of his audience. But whether it be of advantage constantly to speak of the future punishment of the wicked as of a bodily nature, excruciating, and eternal in its duration, to dwell upon and amplify the figurative expressions, which are used concerning it in scripture, till the preacher and the hearer both forget that they are figurative, and begin to understand them as literal descriptions; and to do all this, while one is teaching likewise, that this punishment extends to by far the greater part of our unhappy race; whether the mind of an intelligent man do not escape from such representations by a very natural sentiment of incredulity; and whether it be equally disposed to react against more sober, and what some may call more rational views of future punishment; whether it be well to give such accounts of this extreme punishment, that it may appear not of natural consequence, but of arbitrary appointment, and very seldom to point out how it is, that sin, in the common course of nature, makes the sinner miserable; these are all questions, which every preacher ought to settle for himself. We will give an extract from Dr. Kollock as a specimen of that kind of writing, which we have noticed. It is the conclusion of his second sermon on Christian Education.

"But, O criminal parent, these joys are not for you—for you are reserved tortures, which the heart in vain attempts to conceive. That son, that daughter, whom you are leading to perdition, will descry you amidst the assembled crowd; as they sink in the flames,

they will imprecate the vengeance of God upon your head; they will cry to you in a voice that will rend your heart; 'wretched parent! it is you that have brought us hither! it is you who communicated to us a corrupted nature, and were careless of leading us to God, and inspiring us with holy sentiments; wretch! why didst thou call us into being? why didst thou plunge us into hell? our doom is remediless; but we will become thy tormentors! we will forever present ourselves to thee, surrounded by those flames which consume us, weighed down by those chains of darkness with which we are bound; we will cry to thee, *behold thy work!* The groans, the shrieks, the howlings, which we shall through eternity pour forth, will vibrate in thine ear, will reproach thee for our misery and thy guilt, will kindle a hell within thee more intolerable than the flames in which thou shalt be enwrapped.'

"But I forbear. This picture is too appalling. If the mere anticipation of such a scene freezes the blood, what, oh! what must be its reality!" p. 30, 31.

We will give another extract to the same purpose:

"I cannot, without shuddering, look around on you, my brethren, and think that there are perhaps some in this assembly, to whom this may be the last mean of grace, which God will accompany by his influences on them; some to whom the Spirit is perhaps now giving his last excitement, on the rejection of which he will forever depart, and the destiny of these wretched men be irreversibly fixed; some who may henceforth stand like the blasted fig-tree, only to wither and be burnt, having that awful curse denounced, 'Let no fruit grow on you forever;' (Matt. xxi. 18.) some, on whom, as on the foolish delaying virgins, the door of divine mercy is about forever to be closed, and whose lives will be continued like that of Pharaoh, only to glorify the power and the justice of God—some, in one word, to whom it would be an unspeakable blessing, if God should instantly plunge them into the gulph of despair, since their flames would be far less hot, their woes far less excruciating, than they will hereafter be. God of vengeance! 'my flesh trembleth for fear of thee, and I am afraid of thy judgments!' Father of mercies! forbid that any of us should experience so fearful a doom." p. 75, 76.

The mind of him, who delivered this passage, was dwelling, as he would persuade us, upon one of the most terrible ideas, by which it could be occupied; that some of those about him, whom he had known, perhaps with whom he had conversed familiarly, for whom he had felt, it may be, even a transient complacency, were about to pass into a state, in which they could reasonably look forward to nothing but interminable hor-

ror and agony. There seems to us, however, something artificial in the eloquence of this paragraph, and something frigid in the antithesis, by which it is concluded.

Our notions of the Divine Being, and those of Dr. Kollock, are so fundamentally different, that we do not feel ourselves at liberty to remonstrate with him on any particular representation of the moral character of God, or we might say something to this purpose on the passage just quoted. We will however remark, that another cause, beside what has been mentioned, of the characteristical harshness of his sermons, is the very unamiable and repulsive views which they contain of God, of good men, and of other objects, with which reverence and love have generally been associated. In the description of the day of judgment we are told—

"Innumerable witnesses will be produced to shew the guilt of the unrighteous."..... "All their pious friends and relatives, whose hearts they so deeply wounded on earth by their forgetfulness of God and their eternal destination, will then lift up their voices for the condemnation of those, to whom they were once so tenderly attached. The parent will testify against that ungrateful child, whom he now loves as himself, and for whose neglect of his pious admonitions and entreaties, his 'soul now weeps in secret places.' The husband will testify against that wife, to whom he is united by the tenderest affection, who shares his earthly cares and joys, but who is deaf to his solicitations to form ties for eternity. The wife shall testify against that thoughtless husband, who disregards her gentle but warm and heart-felt supplications, that he will have mercy on his soul. In one word, all the children of God will be compelled to bear witness against those, to whom they were connected by the most tender and endearing human bonds, but who persisted in remaining the enemies of Jesus." p. 376, 377.

In the same description, in an address to the wicked, they are told:—

"Your Judge will then turn upon you *his eyes burning with indignation*, and pronounce upon you that decisive sentence." p. 379.

In the sermon on early piety, God denying his grace to the sinner, who has with premeditation delayed repentance, is represented as addressing him in the following language.

"Go to that world to which you have consecrated your youth; let it rescue you from the grave and from perdition, and give you

eternal felicity. Go to sin, your tyrant, let him give you the wages due unto his slaves, *death*, which is the recompense that he pays to those that serve him. Go to the prince of darkness, to whom you have sold yourselves to do evil. To them you made the offering of your best days; give them also what remains to you." p. 57.

We might produce other passages, but these are sufficient to illustrate our meaning. Such representations, as well as the manner of speaking of future punishment before-mentioned, are adapted to produce a present effect at the public delivery, and a similar end may have been intended in some passages founded upon certain peculiar articles of belief. In his sermon on the agony of Jesus Dr. Kollock exclaims:—

"What is the cause of that astonishing grief which calls down an angel from heaven to strengthen him, the Creator of angels; which urges those strong cries and tears, and forces from his agonized frame that dreadful sweat of blood? p. 121.

A few pages after, he says:

"—Now it was that the wrath of God flamed against him, standing in our stead, with as much violence as though it had exerted itself in one act against the wickedness of all mankind. It is true that during all this time he was most dear to God, and that the Father beheld him with peculiar affection, whilst he was laying down his life for the glory of God and the salvation of man. Nevertheless it is certain that the fierce anger of God was exercised upon him. Any apparent inconsistency in these assertions results from our ignorance of the divine attributes: we are apt to suppose that these attributes resemble human affections, and then to imagine contradictions and inconsistencies. The truth is, we know not what anger is in God; we have no idea whatever of the manner in which Christ bore it—but we know that he did bear it, although he was the object of the Father's tenderest love." p. 125, 126.

In his sermon on the remembrance of the love of Christ, there is the following passage:

"Now where can a greater complication of wonders be discerned, than in the love of your Redeemer? Examine it in every part, and you will find prodigies which nature cannot parallel. That the second person of the adorable Trinity, should leave his heaven and dwell with agonies, that God might be reconciled to us; that the Eternal should become an infant of days; the Infinite, be circumscribed by a human body; the Essentially Blessed, be the man of sorrows; the Ruler of the Universe, the babe of Bethlehem;

are not these sufficiently wonderful to arrest the attention and to fix the remembrance? That he who is God, should be forsaken by God," &c. p. 304.

We do not know whether this be a little more or a little less absurd, than many passages to be found in the Fathers. We have before us one quoted from Maximus Taurinensis, that we think goes somewhat beyond it, and which we will produce. It is a part of a soliloquy put into the mouth of the devil, respecting the person of Christ, when an infant.

"I fear lest he should be a god, who is absolutely without stain. But if he was a god, how could he bear the indignity of being born of a woman? How could he be content with the cradle and swaddling clothes? Who could believe the wailing of an infant in a God; and to whom does it not appear ridiculous that God should be fed with a woman's milk. Besides he is hungry, and it is repugnant to reason that God should be hungry."*

If we thought our advice would be at all regarded by Dr. Kollock, we would suggest to him the advantage, which, it is possible, he might receive from reading that chapter in Dr. Campbell's *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, which treats of "the cause that nonsense so often escapes being detected, both by the writer and by the reader." It might perhaps save him from writing passages, as absurd as what we have quoted from him, and as shocking as the following must be to those, who are in the habit of annexing some ideas to what they read. Speaking of the crucifixion, he says:

"And the Maker of all things is suspended between heaven, which is his throne, and earth, which is his footstool, as though unworthy to occupy a place upon either." p. 164.

In another sermon

"Let us turn aside for a moment, and behold this great sight.

* "*Veretur ne forte deus sit iste, quem nullum potest maculare delictum. Sed si deus esset, quomodo indignitates partus feminei sustineret? Quomodo esset cunia pannisque contentus? Quis credere possit infantis vagitus in deo, cui non audienti ridiculam est deum femineo lacte nutriri? Post omnia ecce esurit, cum utique esurire deum ratio nulla persuadeat.*" Opera, p. 306.

Christians, raise your eyes to the accursed cross; behold extended upon it the eternal Lord, the Creator of heaven and earth, the Judge of quick and dead." p. 301.

The use of such language cannot be spoken of with too severe reprobation. There is no mode of faith, which will in any degree justify it. He must have a wretched desire to be thought eloquent, who can for this purpose make use of expressions, that either have no meaning, or whose meaning is blasphemy.

Another mode of exciting temporary effect, that appears in these sermons, is their general style, which abounds in exclamations and apostrophes, and the use of metaphorical language, that is at least of a character to attract notice. In aiming at strength and effect, their author has fallen into an unusual degree of coarseness and violence of expression. We shall give some examples.

In one of his sermons on Christian Education, in an address to careless and neglectful parents, he describes their children at the house of death as thus apostrophizing them:

" 'Of what avail,' they cry to you, 'of what avail are now all the riches, the honours, and pleasures of the world, which you were anxious to procure for me; why did you not tell me that a single Christ was better than all earthly friends?'" p. 24.

In an exhortation to early piety, while expostulating on the folly of delay, in the expectation of life's being prolonged, he asks,

"Have you ascended into the heavens, and there penetrated into the counsels of that God, 'who holdeth in his hands the keys of life and of death;' who hath appointed the number of your days, beyond which you cannot pass? Or have you fettered the hands of the Almighty, so that he cannot snatch you hence before your repentance?" p. 53.

Speaking of our Saviour in the garden of Gethsemane, he describes him: -

"—Pouring out his strong cries and tears before his heavenly Father, whilst the ground, on which he is stretched, smokes with the blood that rushes from every pore of his agonized frame, which trembles, oppressed by the anguish of his soul." p. 137.

We are not at all pleased with the passage we are about to quote, in which the scourging of Christ is spoken of. It is however very much in the style, in which his sufferings are sometimes described by the French preachers. But neither the character of our Saviour, nor the nature of his sufferings, were of a kind to excite such sentimental pity. He is delivered to the soldiers.

"The brutal and inhuman soldiery, who had long been habituated to murder, and inured to blood, with joy execute the barbarous commission. What a spectacle! The sacred, the tender, the precious body of the Redeemer, is galled and torn by their merciless strokes: his blood, which lately bedewed the ground of Gethsemane, now flows in torrents on the pavement of Pilate's hall." p. 138.

The next passage we quote is the following:

"It was a wish of St. Augustine, that he could have lived in the time of Paul and beheld him delivering his defence before Felix: he has seen what is more desirable, St. Paul shouting the praises of redeeming love before the throne of the Most High God." p. 255.

Again: speaking of the blessed in heaven enjoying the presence of God, the author says:

"We know that, surrounded by his glory, tasting perpetually of his mercy, all our desires will expire in his bosom, and triumphs of joy and of rapture will succeed." p. 257.

In another sermon, describing the death of a saint, he represents him as concluding a series of exclamations with saying:

"'The voice of my beloved calls me, and my heart longs to rest in his embraces.' It is with such transports of joy and holy impatience that his soul leaps into the presence of God, that his heart springs into the arms of Jesus." p. 288.

We will give but one extract more. Speaking of Christ, he says:

"If the curses of the broken covenant hang over us, and hell gape to receive us, yet sheltered in his wounds, no curse can smite us, no flames kindle around us." p. 300.

The maxim of Boileau, *Rien n'est beau que le vrai*, (nothing

is beautiful but what is true,) however it may hold in other composition, is without exception as it respects a sermon. But in these sermons it is almost entirely neglected. There is a constant effort, not to say what is true, but to say what may be striking. In what are intended for the more eloquent passages especially, there is a visible labor after effect; every thing is exaggerated, and forced out of nature. The author does not seem to have prepared himself for the composition of these sermons, by thinking soberly on their subjects, by recollecting what he knew of human nature, and by endeavouring to put himself in the place of an hearer, and considering what modes of address would produce the most permanent effect; but, on the contrary, by throwing himself into an unnatural state of excitation and artificial feeling, and trusting to, what is often not very discriminating, the sympathy of an audience, and to his own powers of delivery, for the effect of what might in such a state be produced.

We do not mean however that there is nothing to praise in these sermons. There are passages, which may be read with pleasure. The principal excellence of these however is, that they are free from those faults, which elsewhere abound. They are those neglected parts, where the author did not think it worth while particularly to exert himself. They contain common ideas, in somewhat animated language, and after the uncomfortable glare of Dr. Kollock's eloquence, they come upon us with a feeling of coolness and refreshment. In the sermon on Early Piety, among others, there are some passages of this character, and in that upon Heaven, the notions of the author were, as it seemed to us, more rational, than, judging from the other discourses, we should have expected.

ARTICLE 2.

A statement of proceedings in the first society in Coventry, Connecticut, which terminated in the removal of the pastor: with an Address to his late people. By Abiel Abbot, late pastor

of the first church in Coventry. Boston, John Eliot, jun. 1811. pp. 68, 8vo.

MR. ABBOT having been nearly sixteen years a reputable minister, his old neighbours and friends, the pastors and messengers of the churches in the county, assemble, and with great unanimity solemnly decree, that he has forfeited both his parish and his office; he is severed from his people and deposed from the ministry. Doubtless he has given cause of scandal by immorality, or he would not receive this deadly blow from hands accustomed to be met in Christian fellowship. This is not the solution, however. His morals are pure. He has apparently as few faults and as many virtues, as most good men; and in some points of conduct he must be allowed to excel. In the reality of his religious persuasions, in sincerity and probity, in love of truth, and diligence in the proper studies of a clergyman, in modesty and humility, in meekness and command of temper; he is to be pronounced, as far as man can judge of man, entitled to as much credit, as his brethren in general; not excepting those who have thought it their duty to shut him from the communion of the faithful. If he has not excited scandal by vice, perhaps he has given offence by indiscretion—disregarding the expedient in a pertinacious adherence to his ideas of the right. He is a rash and wanton assailant of received opinions, a fanatical champion of some peculiar theory, which the people cannot understand or approve, or which they cannot reconcile with sentiments held sacred—a man maintaining what he calls truth by means, and in a spirit, that would seem to be the natural fruit of error. Quite otherwise, Mr. Abbot has yielded nothing to humor, the propensity we all have to speak our minds, and use our tongues as our own, and has sacrificed as much to prudence, as conscience and honor would permit. He has husbanded his reputation and usefulness with miserly thrift, doing nothing voluntarily to awaken a spirit, which he could not expect to resist. Integrity and prudence will not ward off all the evils which man is liable to suffer from his fellow-man; they may even contribute to his misfortunes. The world, or that part of it which providence may invest with a control of our

destiny, may prove an unfair or mistaken interpreter of our best actions; and the prudence of the man, whom it is a favorite point to discredit or destroy, is a reason for measures of greater severity. Such indications of human imperfection are more evident in nothing, than in disputes about religion, and in the deliberations and results of ecclesiastical bodies. The estimate of character, the apprehension of right and wrong, and the distribution of praise and blame, are too often perverted by narrow views or sectarian zeal. Mr. Abbot is deemed to have forfeited his friends and his living—wherein has he offended? He has committed the old protestant sin of regarding the scripture as the only standard of faith; and refusing to express his religious sentiments in the manner prescribed by men. Being subjected to a scrutiny, he is found upon certain difficult points to differ in opinion from a section of his society, including chiefly the church, as distinct from the congregation. He could not take the words set down for him. He could not stretch to the full length of the Procrustes bed, on which he was laid.

The zeal for religion has of late years in many instances seemed to be identified with zeal for that particular form, which it assumes in the creeds and confessions of the Genevan school. The distinctive parts of this system, its definitions and propositions respecting the nature of the Deity, the Saviour, and Redemption, are required to be prominent in preaching, at least occasionally, and are applied as a test of ministerial and Christian communion. This is thought by many an injudicious and mistaken, and where imposed as the condition of fellowship, “an unauthorized restraining of the word of God from that latitude and generality, and the understandings of men from that liberty wherein Christ and his apostles left them.” From particular causes, it was suspected by one or two of Mr. Abbot's church that he did not think the Westminster divines in every respect the best interpreters of scripture. These gentlemen, by great pains and diligence, persuaded a few others that they ought to be dissatisfied with the omissions, if not the declarations of their minister; and that they owed it to their own hopes of salvation to put him upon trial. Having obtained a majority of the church to aid in the process, they began the in-

quisition, which led to the removal of their pastor. A part of the detail of facts is extracted from the pamphlet.

"The unhappy controversy, which has existed for many months in the first ecclesiastical society in Coventry, Connecticut, having at length terminated in the removal of the pastor, the reasons and the manner of it may be a subject of interesting inquiry among many, who have not the means of correct information.

"As I would now gladly find that repose which is congenial with my temper, principles and habits, and escape from the painful scenes which have embittered the close of my ministry, it is not without reluctance that I have yielded to the importunity of friends, and to the request and reasonable expectation of many persons at a distance, to give a plain, unvarnished statement of facts, and such remarks as may set the whole controversy in a just point of light. The task which I undertake is delicate; but I shall not needlessly wound any man's feelings. I will bring no railing accusation. The men from whom I have differed, I have loved; the men from whom I have suffered, I have respected; and to none am I conscious to this hour of feeling an unfriendly sentiment. From the heart I wish them grace, mercy, and peace from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ:

"In February, 1795, I began to preach as a candidate to the first ecclesiastical society in Coventry; and in October following, with unanimity in the church and society, was ordained to the pastoral office. Except by a very few of the church, very little dissatisfaction with my opinions was manifested to me before February, 1810, when most of the brethren met at my house to inquire and converse concerning my opinions. Two of them having stated their sense of the importance of their own opinion concerning Christ and justification, desired me to express my views, with a summary of my reasons for them. On the first point my opinion was stated to this effect, That the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is the only true God, and that Jesus Christ, being the Son of God, has derived all from him. To the inquiry, What is the ground of the sinner's justification before God? My reply was, The mercy of God. After some conversation I observed, that I perceived there was a difference of opinion between me and some, if not all of the church; and perhaps of the society also, and on points in *their view* fundamental. That if this were fact, I could not probably be a very edifying or useful preacher to them; and was therefore willing, if it was the desire of the church and society, whatever domestic inconvenience it might be to me, that my pastoral relation should be dissolved. It was replied that they wished nothing done rashly, and that except what arose from this difference of opinion, they had no desire that the connexion should be dissolved.

"After this interview, the members of the church, without requesting the attendance of the pastor, held frequent meetings; and in June following most of them met at my house for further inquiry and conversation in regard to my opinions. The result of this interview however was not satisfactory.

"At this meeting, they requested me to *preach* on the subjects about which we differed. I complied with their request in several discourses; stating my opinions, not in a controversial manner, and without impugning, in any material respect, the opinions of the aggrieved brethren.

"In September I received a written request 'to warn a church meeting, to consider and resolve on proper measures to be adopted and pursued under our present difficulties.' On the 13th the church met. After opening the meeting with prayer, I made some observations with a view to conciliate the minds of the brethren, and to convince them that the points, concerning which we had different opinions, were not fundamental.

"The church notwithstanding voted their belief of several articles, acknowledged by them to be *incomprehensible*, and yet not expressed in scripture language. To my mind this appears nothing short of a bold attempt to explain incomprehensibility; and even further, to palm on conscience a human gloss for divine truth. However they immediately proceeded to vote to this effect, That as their pastor neither preached nor believed these incomprehensible doctrines thus explained in their own terms, it is expedient to apply to the Association of ministers in the county of Tolland for advice.

"October 2d, the church was advised by the Association to take proper measures for convening the council of the *consociated churches in the county of Tolland*. Being present at the time I observed to the Association, that, in my apprehension, there was no Consociation in the county; and if there were, that I did not consider myself amenable to it. But that I was willing to unite with the church in submitting our difficulties to a mutual council. The committee of the church who were present, said they were not authorized by the church to agree upon such council, and they thought the ministers and churches in the county a more suitable board, to consider and decide the difficulties.

"At a church meeting on the 9th of October, I stated to the church reasons for my settled opinion, that there was no Consociation in the county, to take cognizance of our difficulties. This brief reply was made to my statement by a member, that a plea against jurisdiction was not to be made to the church; and the church then voted compliance with the advice of the Association.

"At the request of the church, the society met on the 15th of November, and declined calling the Consociation, proposed a mutual council, and passed other votes relating to existing difficulties. In consequence of the proposal of the society to convene a mutual

council, the church met November 21st, and voted to unite with the pastor and society in convening a mutual council, '*provided we shall be able to agree with him and the society on the churches from which such council shall be called.*'

"On the 27th of November, there was a convention of the committees of the church and society with the pastor. The committee of the society, in order to promote the desired accommodation, after some conversation, waved their right of selecting any members of the council. The committee of the church and myself then attempted to agree on the churches from which the council should be called. And on the 30th, we met again for the same purpose, but a majority of the committee of the church then refused a mutual council. The majority of the church, being still anxious for a mutual council, after several meetings by themselves, a committee inquired, Whether it would be agreeable to me to unite with the church and society in a mutual council to *dissolve my pastoral relation?* To this inquiry I replied, That I had always been, and still was ready to join in calling such council, when the church and the society should desire it, and that should such council be called, the reasons of my dismissal, and all existing difficulties, must be laid before them.

"February 20th, the church voted to unite with their pastor in calling a mutual council to *dissolve the pastoral relation* subsisting between him and them. The society dissented from this proposal, refusing to join in calling a council thus *restricted*, and *bound to dissolve* the connexion. Disappointed in this attempt, the church committee then proposed to join with me in calling a mutual council to dismiss me, *without the society's consent*. To me this appeared not only improper in itself, but unsafe, as it would be against the express vote of the society; and as such council would be incompetent to annul the contract between me and them.

"Thus failing of the countenance of the society both to the calling of Consociation, and to the calling of a council restricted to dissolve my pastoral relation, the church at length determined to take upon itself the responsibility of the only measure, which would put the case in a train perfectly agreeable to the will of those who had taken a principal part in these measures. Accordingly I was duly notified of a complaint of the church, and of the time for convening 'the council of the consociated churches in the county of Tolland.'"

The council of Consociated churches assembled on the 16th April, and summoned the pastor to appear and answer to the complaints of his church. Mr. Abbot read and presented his protest against their jurisdiction on three grounds, viz. his right to a mutual council, irregularity in the formation of the Consociation, and the incompetency of its powers, deduced

from the Saybrook platform, under which the body professed to act; and the assumption implied in authoritative decisions on doctrinals, by councils of fallible men. The objections are, thus stated:

"Upon principles of equity and the general practice in the churches in New England, I regard myself entitled to an impartial council, mutually chosen by the church and me, to consider and decide the difficulties between us. This has never been offered to me.

"There has never been a convention of elders and messengers in this county to adopt this ecclesiastical constitution. There never has been but one council in the county assuming the name of Consociated, and *that* most certainly irregular. This church has no record or memory of any connexion with Consociation. The pastor has never consented to these articles of agreement. The platform claims to bind neither church nor elder without consent.

"The complaint of this church is entirely concerning opinions, and these stated, not in the words, which the *Holy Ghost* teacheth, but which *man's* wisdom teacheth. For men to determine such a complaint I conceive would be to assume the prerogative of the Lord Jesus Christ. The platform does not permit it; and if it did, it is not warranted by the leading principle of protestantism and the reformation; and I firmly believe such authority is conceded by the word of God to no man or body of men upon earth."

In conclusion he ventures to suggest that the consequences of these proceedings, as well to the cause, as to his people and himself, make a strong appeal to the conscience and sensibility of his fathers and brethren.

The society also, by their committee, make their protest, confirming the statement of their pastor, and warning and requesting the elders and messengers convened to withhold their hand. They bear strong testimony to the worth of their minister, and aver the satisfaction of a great majority with his services.

"We wish to state in behalf of said society, that we have lived in much harmony and peace with our pastor, and that he has been attentive and diligent to promote our peace and welfare: that as a man, a Christian, and a minister, our connexion with him has been highly satisfactory; that he has conducted with such prudence, affection, honesty, and fidelity among us, as greatly to endear himself to us, and to our families.

"Till of late, this church and society appeared well satisfied with the preaching and public performances of their minister. And we have reason to believe, that his occasional labors in the vicinity have been acceptable.

"His preaching has not been often on disputable or controversial points; but upon *repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ*, and well calculated to promote love to God and man, and a holy, virtuous, and sober life.

"Within a short time, one or two of the society have expressed their dissatisfaction with some opinions which they suppose the pastor to hold, on which the Christian church has always been divided. Whatever may be our pastor's view of these subjects, he has not failed to exhibit candor and forbearance towards those who differ from him, and has never endeavoured to disturb the peace of the society with his speculations.

"By great and continued exertions, the minds of some others have been alarmed, and the uneasiness increased. Still, notwithstanding the zeal of the dissatisfied, we are in a good degree a united people, and desirous to enjoy the ministrations of our pastor. There is hardly a society, where the same kind and degree of exertions to excite alarm and dissatisfaction would not procure as great a number of votes to dismiss a pastor as here.

"While great pains have been taken to excite uneasiness and dissatisfaction with our pastor, with less effect, however, than could have been expected, no improper endeavours have been used on his part to disturb the minds of the people, or attach them to him, none but a steady, prudent, and candid behaviour, and a faithful discharge of duty. Indeed, the candour, patience, prudence, fortitude and good temper, which he has uniformly maintained in his great trials, have excited our admiration, and contributed not a little to endear him unto us. If we were to part with our minister, we see no prospect of our being so well united in another."

These protests did not avail, and the Council voted that they were duly convened and authorized to try the complaint before them, which they proceeded to do of course on *ex parte* evidence, Mr. Abbot abiding by his protest. This evidence he alleges, without impeaching the integrity of any, would undoubtedly have had a different aspect, if the witnesses had been examined by both parties, improper testimony prevented, or just explanations admitted. During this procedure a mutual council was again proposed without effect. The result was made that Mr. Abbot was guilty of the facts alleged against him, as follows:

"That he does neither preach, nor believe in the divinity of

Jesus Christ; that he is both God and man united in the person of Mediator.

"That he does neither preach nor believe the doctrine of the atonement made for sin by the blood of Christ, and of the justification of sinners by the righteousness of Christ, imputed to them and received by faith in him.

"The foregoing doctrines, though clearly revealed in the word of God, as not only true, but fundamental in the gospel system, and essential to be believed in order to salvation, are by him omitted in his preaching; and doctrines contrary to these and repugnant to the faith once delivered to the saints by Christ and his apostles, and subversive of the Christian's hope, are by him taught and inculcated." p. 37.

The Council proceed to vindicate their jurisdiction, and declare that the ministerial relation between Mr. Abbot and his church ought to be and is dissolved, and revoke his commission to preach the gospel.

The author remarks upon the *result*, as an instrument of extraordinary, and as he believes, of unexampled aspect. It rests on facts, which he seems to prove never existed. His observations on the positive part of the charge, of which the Council say he is guilty, are:—

"There was no *positive* charge in the complaint. It is wholly composed of negatives; and are negatives susceptible of direct proof? If it be said, there was a positive charge of teaching doctrines 'repugnant to the faith, and subversive of the Christian's hope,' I repel the slander with indignation. But the church never brought this forward as a charge; and when called upon by a judicious member of the council to produce their evidence on this point fully, as to him it appeared to be the only positive charge before the council, the committee of the church very frankly acknowledged, that they *had no evidence to produce*, other than had appeared on the other charges. In other words, this was a point, the direct proof of which they were not inclined to undertake. It is evident that this most offensive and groundless insinuation was intended to bring up the rear of negative charges; and lend a colouring to them, which might alarm the council, and inconsiderate men that should read or hear the complaint; an effect, which *negative* charges alone might be incompetent to produce. I forbear further comment on a point, which has more deeply wounded my mind, than any other in this extraordinary complaint." p. 32, 33.

The minister and the society, according to notice given to the other party, proceed to convoke another council, to see if their case was as desperate, as it would seem from the result of

the body just dissolved. They fixed upon a portion of the church at a considerable distance, in Massachusetts. Most of the elders and three of the messengers invited, acceded to the request, and assembled at Coventry in June. Those, who did not go, expressed their willingness to support their brother in the exercise of his Christian liberty, and gave a general opinion, as far as the facts known to them would admit, that the principles, upon which he was deposed, were untenable. A very explicit and pointed letter from Dr. Osgood on the subject is among the documents. This last council gave their testimony to the good ministerial and Christian character of the minister. They think that the disciples of a common Master ought to unite under his authority and make his gospel, without addition or diminution, the basis of ministerial intercourse and Christian communion; and that Mr. Abbot, appearing to them an intelligent and sincere believer in the scripture, and receiving it as the standard of his faith, ought to be allowed that liberty of construction, which all claim for themselves. The Consociation is irregular and unauthorized, and virtually the church judging in their own cause; and therefore Mr. Abbot is still a minister and their minister. Considering however that Mr. Abbot's real or supposed opinions make him obnoxious to an important minority of the society, who are also in the church, and that his usefulness and comfort in such a situation must be very much in hazard, they think it lawful and advisable that he should go away. Whilst they declare his separation from this people, they rescind the revocation of his commission, by the last assembly, and cordially recommend Mr. Abbot to all Christian societies.

The history of these proceedings affords many more topics of remark, than we can consider.

It bodes ill to a minister to differ in opinion from one or two principal parishioners in their favorite points, especially theological. Let him beware how he incurs the suspicion of doubting any part of the popular creed, or disliking any of the dialect in received formularies. It is setting up for being wiser than other people; and if he really should happen to think differently from a few persons, who lived two hundred years

ago, and made certain propositions, and should be an upright man at the same time, it must put him in the power of such as deem it their duty to call the articles of a catechism, made at Westminster, the faith once delivered to the saints; and who possibly may have their zeal for this faith sublimed by the ambition of guiding other people's opinions; especially of those whom a sense of dependence should make afraid to differ. He may do very well, so long as he is supposed to acquiesce in their views. Though he never introduces in so many words the venerated propositions, and though he confines his instructions to the less disputed and more intelligible doctrines and duties of Christianity, instead of attempting the dubious and obscure; yet the hearers may think they are well taught, and that their attention is called, as it will be, to every important truth. But let the good man be placed in a situation, where he must virtually or explicitly declare his party and give a pretext to any for believing or saying, that he is not as thorough going in particular opinions, as they thought him; let him have occasion, for example, to attempt to save, whom they are intent to destroy, and forgive and forbear the heterodox brother, whom they have resolved to proscribe; if he is not more cunning than honest, farewell to the soundness of the preacher, to the docility and confidence of the hearer. Now forsooth he is full of flaws; he omits fundamental doctrines. The same discourses, which were once considered edifying or unexceptionable, they are surprised did not appear to them as suspicious and unsatisfactory as at present.* You may calculate that at the proper time he will be requested to give what is called satisfaction concerning his sentiments. His

* "We cast out our doctrine almost as a football is turned out among boys in the street; in some congregations few understand it, but every one censureth it. Few come as learners or teachable disciples, but most come to sit as judges on their teacher's words, and yet have not either the skill, or the patience, or the diligence, which is necessary in a just trial to a right judgment. But as words agree or disagree with the former conceptions of every hearer, so are they judged to be wise or foolish, sound or unsound, true or false, fit or unfit. They heedlessly leave out, or put in, or alter and misrepresent plain words, and with confidence affirm those things to be said, that were never said, but perhaps the contrary." *Baxter's dying thoughts Pract. Vol. iii. p. 882.*

good friends apprehend he is guilty, but are not quite certain, and will therefore be much obliged to him to accuse himself; or, to state the more charitable side, hope he is innocent, and ask him to clear himself.

The church in distinction from the congregation has a principal agency in ecclesiastical affairs, especially when a minister is to be made or broken. It is natural it should be so; the church being an association of individuals in the society, explicitly pledged to a regular observance of Christian rites and to an exemplary life. It were to be wished the terms of admission might be so fixed, that all who are willing to give this pledge might be encouraged to do it. In many places admission into this body is considered as the sign of a precise measure of religious attainments, which many of the best disposed hesitate to claim; and when told, that the relation to the church visible implies that the initiated in his own view and in the view of others is sealed for the church invisible, they forbear making so high a pretension. The church have exclusive access to one of the ordinances, the supper, and in many parts to the right of baptism for their children. With all the service, which this part of the Christian community render the cause, they are not always exempt from prejudices and infirmities, incident to an association so constituted and circumstanced. They are found sometimes to urge questions affecting the peace and edification of the society at large, with an inflexibility not to be approved, showing that power of all kinds is liable to abuse.

Mr. Abbot does not complain of his church for being argued, persuaded, or terrified, out of their good opinion of him. Nor does he deny the consciousness of right views to those who might be principals in accomplishing this alienation of his old friends; nor could it be expected that ceasing to hear him with approbation or conviction, they should not endeavour to obtain by his removal the opportunity of hearing another. To meet undeserved opposition, and for doing the best that circumstances admit, to suffer the evils, that should seem the punishment of doing the worst, is hard; but to encounter such adversities deserving them, is inexpressibly harder. Though this gentleman must have expected, when feelings were roused, which

there is no composing drug to allay, to be put on trial, he could not expect that the brethren would insist on being their own judges; or that the other pastors and churches would, without obvious necessity, fall in with the aggrieved party in such a design; and still less that they would do it in the face of such difficulties and objections as beset the way, which they finally took to their object. Such expectations would appear to be imputing to his brethren more solicitude about the end than the means, and implying that he was refused a mutual council, lest he should not be dismissed; or be dismissed without being deposed, and they should lose the opportunity of authoritatively declaring him an outcast from the ministry and church of Christ.

It is evident indeed, that the imposing, judging, exclusive system in respect to articles of belief, is maintained with full conviction and active zeal by a numerous party of our religious public. They think themselves authorised and required to make certain explications and statements of the doctrine of the scriptures essential to Christian and ministerial communion. Yet it cannot be denied that these representations of Christianity are in some particulars at variance with the sentiments of many enlightened and sincere Christians. They are bound to inquire and judge according to the light they receive. They do this, and you say they shall not teach, or the people shall not hear at their peril. They are renounced by the disciples for being faithful to their common master. There must be some fallacy in the reasoning, which results in the conclusion that one half the Christian world may inflict a penalty on the other for not obeying man rather than God. One source of the error in the imposing brethren undoubtedly is, confounding their opinions or statements with the scriptures, and themselves with the apostles. All the censures and anathemas uttered by Paul and the divinely commissioned teachers of the gospel, they apply to those who dissent from them, and then claim the authority of these inspired men, for rejecting their opposers, and stopping their mouths. "The popes, when they assumed the power of the apostles, laid claim also to their infallibility, and in this they were consistent. Protestant churches renounce with all their

might this infallibility, whilst they apply to themselves every expression that describes it, and will not part with a jot of the authority that is built upon it." Other very doubtful positions are taken to justify the spirit of exclusion. One seems to be that the terms of communion are in a great measure conventional. "Whereas a church is not a private club or association, at liberty to make by-laws for itself at pleasure, but a public religious society, subject to the lawgiver of the church, the founder of the society, and having such rights, and such only, as he has given. Hence the church invades the rights of other churches and of the members of its own, if it makes assent to any confessions or creeds, which the gospel has not expressly authorized, the condition of its esteem and brotherly love." "Christian esteem, Christian fellowship, are to be rendered not merely where we *please*, but where they are *due*." We cannot have the satisfaction of punishing those, whose sentiments we dislike on such cheap conditions, as we may at first think. If we excommunicate men for insufficient reasons, men enlightened and sincere, who have as ample means, and not fewer motives to be right than ourselves, we do it at the peril of judging another man's servant. But have not we a conscience, says the excluding party, not less than the heterodox brother? If he is as good as he pretends, he will rather suffer than we should do wrong, and commit the sin of forbearing one, whom we think it our duty to reject. Now it is one thing to be right, for every man to follow his judgment of duty, and another to show that the action he performs is right, or the judgment from which it proceeds correct. To tell a man, deposed for not assenting to what he disbelieves, that he ought to be comforted, since, though he loses his support, he retains his conscience, and saves that of his brother who excludes him, is too much like Julian's "blessed are ye poor," to the Christians whom he impoverished. It is well observed, that men of conscience are more wanted than formidable, to any church, however pure.—The imposition of human explications is inconsistent with the respect due to the scriptures. It implies that in essential points the words of God are less perspicuous than those of men. On the pretext of maintaining the bible, it is virtually denying its sufficiency as a

rule of faith.—This system is defended by some persons as favorable to unity of sentiment and profession. It must be acknowledged that it has a considerable influence of this kind. A prudent man will take precious care if possible not to think or preach himself out of his living, and will be not a little tempted not “to think at all, to avoid thinking wrong.” It might be an effectual security against diversity of sects, and all pestilential heresies; if, notwithstanding the discouragements to religious inquiry and profession, certain men did not determine that being to answer for themselves, they must judge for themselves, and must at all events avoid falsehood and insincerity; and if moreover the laws of the country were as little favourable to religious liberty, as the maxims and spirit of the prevailing sect—It is some deduction from the value of a unity thus obtained, that it is obtained at the expense of that inquiry and discussion, which the interests of truth require; and that it “is not giving truth a fair chance, to decide points at one certain time, and by one set of men, which had much better be left to the successive inquiries of different ages and different persons.” Had the success of this imposing system been complete, the protestant world would have lost the blessings of the reformation, and our ancestors the honor of nonconformity. Calvin would not have dared to enter his protest, as we believe he did, against what he calls the barbarous word, Trinity, let his ideas of the doctrine be ever so much approved; and the founders of the Divinity College would have been obliged to insert “imputation” in their formulary.—To use, with moderation, the power, which ecclesiastical regulation or popular opinion gives, of fixing the brand of heresy on a fellow creature, is no very easy task. We must surmount the prejudice, to which all are exposed by judging of things less known, by those which are more known. Hence it is, that finding particular sentiments and even words associated with our own good affections and religious hopes, we suppose there can be no goodness in those, who have in any point different views. We must overcome unfeelingness and often malignity, toward the doubters or opposers of our tenets—the natural consequence of believing ourselves in some sense partizans with the Divinity against his

supposed enemies; and of making a *principle* of that aversion, which is little better than human passion. We must grapple with ambition and pride, and cease to consider and treat religion as though it was designed to furnish a ground of self-exaltation, and supply a pretext for claiming superiority over others—when it is purely intended to make us good and happy. We must unite to a decent deference to authority, a caution against implicit faith; and consider the many innocent as well as blamable causes, that determine men's opinions. We must remember our ignorance and fallibility—and whilst we rest with confidence in the leading objects of belief and the great laws of conduct, refrain from dogmatizing on things uncertain and unimportant.

The spirit of Mr. Abbot's book is honorable to his heart, and its execution to his talents and good sense. It cannot fail to interest every reader of any reflection or sensibility. We trust it will be no offence to Mr. Abbot's consociated brethren, that he has again found bread and employment; being placed at the head of that respectable and well endowed institution, Dummer Academy. His well known qualifications, as an instructor, his scholarship, industry, fidelity, patience, and good temper, justified the election. Whatever become of speculations, we believe it will be well for church and state to be always served by men resembling Mr. Abbot in purity of principle, goodness of heart, and integrity of life.

ARTICLE 3.

1. *Two Lectures on Comets, read in the chapel of Harvard College in Cambridge, New England, in April 1759. By John Winthrop Esq., Hollisian Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy in Cambridge. Boston, 1759, 8vo.*
2. *An Essay on Comets, in two parts, by Andrew Oliver jun. Esq. Salem, 1772, 8vo. [the above reprinted at Boston 1811.]*

THE comet of 1759, the occasion of the pamphlets before us, forms an important epoch in the history of astronomy. It was

the first, whose return was foretold, and which really appeared agreeably to the prediction. We are told, indeed, that the ancient Egyptians and Chaldeans, by a long course of observations, were able to predict the appearance of comets. But as we are informed also, that they were able to prognosticate earthquakes and tempests, there can be little doubt that these predictions, instead of being the result of sound astronomical science, are to be ranked among the ridiculous pretensions of astrology. Still these ancient observers of the heavens are entitled to the credit of attaining to juster notions of the heavenly bodies, than generally prevailed, and perhaps of giving Pythagoras the first hint toward a correct view, not only of comets, but of the solar system in general.

But the opinion of Aristotle,* that comets are a sort of combustible vapour, exhaled from the earth, and set on fire in the upper regions of the atmosphere, has been almost universally received, till within a little more than two centuries, and has undoubtedly been the reason why this most obscure and difficult part of astronomy has been so much neglected. For comets being looked upon as of the same nature with those transient meteors, or shooting stars, which so frequently attract a momentary notice, little care was taken to make and preserve such observations, as would tend to establish their true character and importance. They were therefore generally regarded as a sort of prodigies, sent to forewarn mankind of some terrible calamity.

Seneca however rose above the opinions of his time, and saw in those wandering stars marks of dignity and permanency, that entitled them, in his opinion, to a rank among the eternal works of nature.† He accordingly recommends it as an object worthy of attention, and as the method by which so much was known of the other heavenly bodies, to observe and keep a record of these phenomena, that it might be ascertained, whether they return periodically, like the planets. Time and care,

* Aristotle says, that all comets (*καμηται*;) disappear without setting; from which it is evident that he included meteors under this term.

† *Ego nostris non assentior. Non enim existimo cometen subitaneum ignem, sed inter æterna opera naturæ.* Nat. Quæst. lib. vii. cap. xxii.

he says, will throw light upon this subject, and posterity will wonder at our ignorance of things so plain and easy to be known.*

The recommendation of this excellent philosopher however was disregarded, and ages were suffered to pass away without affording any prospect of the fulfillment of his prediction, while mankind suffered the just punishment of their ignorance in the terror and alarm, to which they were so frequently exposed.

At length the opinion of Seneca was in part revived by Tycho Brahe, and confirmed by actual observation. The example was followed by others; and, though different opinions prevailed with regard to the nature of these bodies, yet each had recourse to observation for evidence in support of the hypothesis he had adopted. Thus, the way being opened, and materials collected, it was reserved for the genius of Newton, after unfolding the mysteries of the planetary motions, to reveal also the hidden courses of comets, that as they together form but one whole, and proceeded from one cause, their explanation also might be the work of one mind.

Indeed Newton himself had an opportunity of observing a comet, singularly favourable for his purpose. At a time when his mind was richly stored with knowledge, and in its full vigor, and when observatories were erected in different parts of Europe, and instruments for observation were improved and multiplied, accompanied with a zeal and diligence before unknown; under circumstances so auspicious, a comet

* " Quid ergo miramur, Cometas, tam rarum mundi spectaculum, nondum teneri legibus certis: nec initia illorum finésque notescere, quorum ex ingentibus intervallis recursus est? Nondum sunt anni mille quingenti, ex qua Græcia stellis numeros et nomina fecit. Multæque hodie sunt gentes, quæ tantum facie noverunt cælum, quæ nondum sciant cur luna deficiat, quare obumbretur. Hoc apud nos quoque nuper ratio ad certum perduxit. Veniet tempus, quo ista quæ nunc latent, in lucem dies extrahat, & longioris sui diligentia. Ad inquisitionem tantorum ætas vna non sufficit, ut tota cælo vacet. Quid, quod tam paucos annos inter studia ac vitia non æqua portione diuidimus? Itaque per successiones istas longas explicabuntur. Veniet tempus, quo posterì nostri tam aperta nos nescisse mirentur." Seneca Nat. Quæst. lib. vii. cap. xxv.

presented itself, distinguished almost above all others for the rare and interesting phenomena which it exhibited.*

This comet was seen in the morning on its way toward the sun, from the 4th to the 25th of November; and after it passed the sun, in the evening, from the 13th of December to the 9th of March following. Its tail appeared under an angle of 70° and very brilliant. Upon the numerous and accurate observations of this comet, made in different parts of Europe, was founded the theory which has since prevailed; that comets are solid, opaque, and durable bodies, which revolve round the sun in very oblique and eccentric ellipses; that they are indeed a kind of planets, carried along in their courses by the same power, observing the same laws, and differing indeed only in the eccentricity and obliquity of their orbits, and in the extent and density of their atmospheres. This theory, so simple in itself, and so agreeable to analogy, solves in a wonderful manner the various phenomena of comets; and nothing was now wanting to complete it, and secure it universal reception, but a prediction grounded upon it, followed by a corresponding event.

It was accordingly submitted to this test. On the supposition, that comets revolve round the sun, like the planets, it was presumed that no two of them are so situated, as to interfere materially with each other's motions; that is, as no two planets have the same distance from the sun, or cross the ecliptic in the same point, it was fairly concluded, that an agreement in ele-

* The following just and elegant character of Newton introduced by Pingré after the mention of this comet, we think will be acceptable to some of our readers. Coming from a foreigner it has double value, and does great honor to the writer.

“ Lorsque la Comète de 1680 parut, le vaste génie de Newton embrassoit l'Univers entier. Physicien éclairé, Géomètre pénétrant, Astronome intelligent, il renfermoit en lui seul des talens dont chacun en particulier auroit suffi pour éterniser la mémoire de tout autre Philosophe. L'étendue de ses connoissances en tout genre l'exemptoit de la nécessité de recourir à des lumières étrangères. Seul il étudioit la Nature dans la Nature même, il saisissoit les moindres secrets qu'elle laissoit échapper, il approfondissoit les idées, il combinait les rapports. Sublime dans ses vues, simple dans ses principes, profond dans ses recherches, solide dans ses raisonnemens, réservé dans ses conséquences; un tel homme étoit fait pour iustruire l'Univers. Il l'instruisit.” *Cométographie* tom. I. p. 148.

ments of this kind would indicate different appearances of the same comet. Upon a presumption so rational, Dr. Halley, having calculated the elements* of a large number of comets from the best observations which he could obtain, was induced from a remarkable agreement in some of them to hazard the prediction, which has rendered his name so conspicuous in cometary astronomy. "There are many things," says he, "which make me believe that the comet, which Apian observed in the year 1531, was the same with that which Kepler and Longomontanus more accurately described in the year 1607, and which I myself have seen return and observed in the year 1682. All the elements agree, and nothing seems to contradict this my opinion, besides the inequality of the periodic revolutions; which inequality is not so great neither, as that it may not be owing to physical causes. For the motion of Saturn is so disturbed by Jupiter and the other planets, that the periodic time of the planet is uncertain for some whole days together. How much more will a comet be subject to such like errors, which rises almost four times higher than Saturn, and whose velocity, though increased but a very little, would be sufficient to change its orbit from an elliptical to a parabolic one. And I

* The elements of the orbit of a comet are six. 1 The place of the node, or point in the ecliptic, where the plane of the comet's orbit intersects it. 2 The inclination, or angle, which the plane of the comet's orbit makes with that of the ecliptic. 3 The perihelion distance, or nearest approach of the comet to the sun. 4 The place of the perihelion, or situation of this point in the orbit of the comet. 5 The time of the comet's passing this point. 6 The direction of the motion, whether in the order in which the planets move, or the contrary. With these elements, we may easily calculate the place of a comet for any time during its appearance, and when it returns, recognize it as the same comet. They also enable us to determine several other particulars, as the distance and situation of a comet with respect to the earth and sun; and with the apparent diameter of the nucleus and length of the tail, to determine the absolute dimensions of each. But the period of a comet, or the time in which it makes an entire revolution, cannot ordinarily be determined with any certainty, on account of the small extent of the arc described during its appearance, and the necessary imperfection of observations. This was attempted by the greatest mathematicians in the case of the comet of 1680, whose computed period, according to Euler, was 166½ years; according to Newton 500; according to Pingré 15,865.

"am the more confirmed in my opinion of its being the same, for in the year 1456, in the summer time, a comet was seen passing retrograde between the earth and the sun, much after the same manner; which, although no one made observations upon it, yet from its period, and the manner of its transit, I cannot think different from those I have just mentioned, and since looking over the histories of comets I find at an equal interval of time, a comet to have been seen about Easter in the year 1303, which is another double period of 151 years before the former. Hence I think I may venture to foretel that it will return again in the year 1758."*

Dr. Halley, observing a considerable difference in the supposed periods of this comet, and justly ascribing it to the influence of the planets, made a rough estimate of the probable effect of Jupiter in delaying its next return, and finally fixed upon the latter part of 1758, or beginning of 1759, as the time when he supposed it would appear. M. Clairaut,† an eminent French mathematician, computed the effect of both Saturn and Jupiter, and found that the former would retard its return 100 and the latter 511 days. He therefore determined the time when the comet ought to come to its perihelion to be the 15th of April, 1759; observing that he might err a month from neglecting small quantities in the computation. This prediction was announced in the Memoirs of the Academy of Sciences, November 1758. The comet actually made its appearance near the commencement of the year 1758, and passed its perihelion on the 12th of March following, within the limits of the errors, to which the results of the calculations were supposed to be liable. After a revision of his calculations, Clairaut reduced the time of the comet's passing the perihelion to the 4th of April, and he would have brought it to the 25th of March, if he had employed the mass of Saturn, such as it has since been determined. The time might be approximated still near-

* *Synopsis Astronomiæ Cometar.*

† This was by the suggestion and with the assistance of La Lande, as the latter informs us, though we do not learn it from any other source. *Malgré l'immensité des calculs que nous fîmes à cette occasion, M. Clairaut et moi, &c. La Lande's Astron. tom. iii. p. 271. ed. 3d.*

et by taking into consideration the influence of the planet Herschel, whose existence was not then known. "Let us here remark," says La Place, "for the honor of the human understanding, that this comet, which in this century excited only the curiosity of astronomers and mathematicians, had been regarded in a very different manner four revolutions before, when it appeared in 1456; its long tail spreading consternation over all Europe, already terrified at the rapid success of the Turkish arms, which had just destroyed the ~~great~~ empire. Pope Calixtus on this occasion, ordered a prayer, in which the comet and the Turks were included in the same anathema. Another visit may be expected from this comet in 1834."*

It will be presumed that no small interest was excited as the time approached for the return of this comet, involving, as it did, not only the reputation of those who had predicted it, but also the whole theory of Newton and the honor of science. Great pains were taken to ascertain that part of the heavens where it was expected to make its first appearance, and also to meet it on its way, as far as the best instruments would reach. Astronomers, particularly in France, contended with each other for the honor of announcing so important an event to the world. De l'Isle† at Paris had made known to the public his preparations for observing it. But his disciple Messier, who, with a zeal and patience the most indefatigable, had been looking for it for

* It may be said perhaps that too much is built upon the return of this comet, since none appeared in 1790, as Dr. Halley predicted, and as was generally expected. But it is now well known, that the calculations which led to that prediction were formed upon erroneous observations. Mechain, having collected all the observations in 1532, calculated the orbit again, and found it to differ materially from that determined by Dr. Halley. La Place has applied the doctrine of chances to this subject, in order to show how far we might presume upon the identity of three appearances, which were thought to authorise the prediction. In the case of the comet expected in 1790, he makes the probability equal only to $\frac{2}{3}$, whereas in that of 1759 it is estimated at no less than $\frac{1290}{1291}$. *Exposition du système du monde*, p. 123.

† *Cométophagie*, tom. ii. p. 64.

more than a year, had the good fortune to catch the first glimpse of this grateful spectacle. This was on the 21st of January.* But he was prevented by his master from giving notice of so interesting a discovery. He therefore continued for several weeks to be the only attendant upon this guest, that ought to have been so welcome to the followers of Newton; and although many of the members of the Academy, probably from a passion unworthy their character, affected to disregard these early observations, their conformity to subsequent ones secured them at length an honorable admission in the memoirs of that learned body.†

This comet was first seen in this part of the world, as Dr. Winthrop informs us, on the third of April in the morning, and after disappearing about ten days at the end of the month, in consequence of its passing so far to the south as to continue below the horizon, it reappeared and continued visible, till about the last of May, when it became too faint to be seen. In the mean time the lectures before us were read in the chapel of Harvard college. They give us in a style of uncommon correctness and perspicuity, the most important particulars relating to the subject of comets, so far as they were then understood and admitted of being treated in a popular discourse.

The first lecture is devoted principally to a discussion of the principal opinions, that have been entertained at different times, with regard to the nature of these bodies. Of these opinions we have already given an abstract, and there is no need, at this time, of undertaking formally to refute what nobody believes.

The second lecture states the Newtonian doctrine of comets, together with the arguments on which it rests; and the Appendix contains a very full and minute account of the Halleian comet, as it has been since called, at its several former appearances, as far back as any record of it is to be found in the

* We mean only, that he was the first who discovered this comet in France. It was seen near Dresden on the 25th of December, and at Leipzig on the 18th of January.

† The name of Messier has been given by La Lande to a new constellation between Cassiopeia, Cepheus, and Camelopardalis.

history of comets. The whole bears evident marks of a thorough and familiar acquaintance with the subject, and is interspersed with remarks and observations, that could come only from a man of extensive knowledge, a philosophic mind, and enlightened piety. He notices with great justness the marks of design, apparent in the figure and position of the orbits of comets and in their retrograde motion. "By means of their eccentricity," says he, "they run so swiftly through the planetary regions, as to have very little time to disturb their own motions, or those of the planets. And this end is still more effectually answered in those comets, whose motion is retrograde, or contrary to that of the planets. In this case, the relative velocity, wherewith the comet and planet run by each other, is the *sum*, but when they move the same way as the planets, it is the *difference*, of their real velocities. By this great eccentricity, likewise, as well as by the very different situation of their planes, they are at vast distances from each other in their aphelia; where their motions are so slow, and their gravitation to the sun so weak, that their mutual gravitation might produce irregularities, and perhaps throw the system into confusion, which this precaution has guarded against."

There is another view of this subject, from which Dr. Winthrop undertakes, though we think with less sagacity, to deduce some moral reflections. "Such grand and unusual phenomena," he observes, "tend to rouse mankind, who are apt to fall asleep, while all things continue as they were—to awaken their attention and to direct it to the Supreme Governor of the universe, whom they would be in danger of totally forgetting, were nature always to glide along in the same uniform tenor."

We readily admit that such extraordinary appearances have had an important influence upon the minds of men. But whether that influence, especially in a state of ignorance, be salutary or pernicious, we think, at least very questionable. Their rare occurrence and singular aspect have given them, it is true, somewhat of the character and effect of miracles, and have impressed mankind, very forcibly, with the apprehension of some superior being, but of a being whose only attribute was pow-

er, and whose commission punishment. Men seem by a sort of instinct to look upon the heavens, as the proper theatre for the manifestation of the divine attributes and purposes to the inhabitants of the earth; and, when any unusual phenomenon presents itself, they are induced by a fundamental law of the mind to expect consequences correspondent to such a supposed interposition, or interruption of established order. And thus events of great moment, in the moral and political world, are taken out of their proper connexion and referred to these unusual appearances in the natural world, and derangement and confusion ensue. This we think has in fact been the operation of such phenomena as comets and eclipses. They have tended to draw off the attention of men from the operation of those uniform immutable laws, which are the best indication of the character of the moral governor, and led them to ascribe to sudden indignation or caprice in some being, they knew not what, those disasters, which they might otherwise have traced to their proper origin, and thus have learned the only method of averting them. To have contributed something toward remedying an evil of such magnitude, for it must be confessed that it still continued, long after the establishment of Christianity, and in the very bosom of the church, is perhaps the greatest boast of astronomy. It is therefore with much pleasure, that we contemplate the labors of those, who have cultivated this science with so much success; a science, which has justly been called* "the most splendid monument of the powers of the human understanding;" since it has not only done essential service to geography, navigation, and chronology; but has shed its light also upon the moral world. While it has extirpated a great positive evil, by dispelling those vain fears, which have been the scourge and scandal of every age, it has given us juster notions of the power and providence of God. On the one hand, it has humbled us by showing us how inconsiderable we are in the immensity of the worlds that surround us; on the other, it has exalted us by the views which it unfolds, and the

* L'Astronomie, considérée dans son ensemble, est le plus beau monument de l'esprit humain. La Place.

thoughts, which it inspires of the wisdom and greatness of that Being, who "pervades and animates the wondrous whole."

Dr. Winthrop adopts the opinion of Newton respecting that singular phenomenon, which generally accompanies comets, called the tail; and evidently after mature deliberation and with a full view of the subject; for he had some time before communicated to the Royal Society of London an ingenious and elaborate paper,* giving a geometrical explanation of the mechanism of this phenomena. The hypothesis of Newton supposes that the tails of comets are a sort of vapour, sufficiently dense to reflect the rays of light, sent out from the head in consequence of being heated by the sun's rays, and elevated, by the buoyancy of the atmosphere, or some ethereal fluid surrounding the sun to a great extent; just as smoke rises in a chimney by being entangled in rarified air, which is necessarily carried up on account of its relative lightness.

This explanation, it must be confessed, is attended with very great difficulties, and seems not to have been advanced with much confidence by Newton himself. The tail of a comet moves with nearly the same angular velocity, as the head, and of course must move much faster, as it is more distant from the sun. Now without having recourse to, a resisting medium, rendered necessary by the very hypothesis, it is not very easy to conceive what there is to accelerate the progress of this vapour, as it recedes from the comet; especially when its distance becomes so great, as almost entirely to lose its gravity, and that at the very time, when it is most wanted; if that is to be the mean, by which it is to continue attached to the body. Take the comet, for instance, which we have recently seen, and which was visible when it passed its perihelion. Its tail was not very sensibly incurvated; although, had it been, our situation was not unfavourable for observing it; and yet to maintain this position, the extreme part of it must have been carried along with a velocity, at least a third part greater, than that which it received from the head at the time of its ascent. It cannot be supposed, that it is constantly dissipated and replaced by a stream of new matter; for in that case it must move with

* *Cogitata de cometis*, published in the 75th vol. of the *Phil. Trans.*

the velocity of light; and Newton himself supposed that in the case of the comet of 1680, the extreme part of the tail was forty five days in rising. But we will not consume the time of our readers on this intricate subject, which has perplexed and divided the greatest philosophers. The opinion of Newton has labored very much, even with many of his most devoted followers; and some have rejected it altogether.

Mr. Oliver is to be commended for having attempted, although with some diffidence, a more satisfactory solution of this phenomenon. He begins, as most others have done, who broach new opinions, with exposing the insufficiency of those commonly received. He undertakes to shew that Newton's account of the tails of comets is altogether irreconcilable with the inference which he draws from the freedom of their motion, relative to the vacuity of the celestial spaces. And so indeed it would seem; yet if any one will read attentively what Newton says on this subject, he will be satisfied that this is not a loose hint, thrown out by the by; but that this great philosopher, no less remarkable for his caution than for his penetration, knew what he was about too well to expose himself to so palpable an inconsistency.*

Mr. Oliver supposes that the tails of comets arise from the elastic nature of those fluids, which surround the heavenly bodies; that as a comet approaches its perihelion, its atmosphere is evidently repelled by that of the sun, and thrown off to vast distances, and there reflects the light of the sun, which falls upon it, producing the appearance which we observe. He sets out with proving very formally that the earth, and probably the sun and planets, are surrounded with atmospheres; that these atmospheres are very elastic, and capable of great expansion. So far Mr. Oliver is very safe, though not very original. The foundation of his hypothesis is sufficiently deep and broad, and the only fault we find is, that this is all. He does not produce a single fact, or a sound principle, that advances him a step farther. We readily grant that the particles of air are repellent, and that we know no limit to this repulsion; but we believe at the same time, that this is owing to some medium interposed, and not to any proper intrinsic quality in the sub-

* See quotation from Newton, p. 174.

stance which causes the parts of it to recede from each other ad infinitum; and that two distinct portions of this fluid, separated from each other by many millions of miles of void space,* would no more repel each other, than two leaden balls. But even admitting all that Mr. Oliver wants, we do not see how he is to get along. Let it be supposed then, that the sun's atmosphere exerts this repulsive power through a space of one hundred, nay one hundred and fifty millions of miles, as in the case of the present comet. Not only is it necessary to suppose this force to exist, but also that it is sufficient to overcome the sun's gravity, and even to detach this atmosphere from the immediate neighbourhood of the comet, and to carry it sixty or seventy millions of miles farther; whereas, if this atmosphere itself, without the attractive power of the body of the comet to retain it, were plunged into the very atmosphere of the sun, it must be kept there by the same force, which prevents the sun's own atmosphere from flying into the remote regions of space. Besides all this, the phenomenon itself is altogether different from what the power supposed, did it exist, must necessarily produce. We should expect to find, that as the comet approached its perihelion, the atmosphere on the side next the sun would be driven back so as to appear manifestly less extensive in that direction, if not to leave the nucleus entirely bare; but we have no account of any difference in this respect being observed. Without any apparent disturbance of the great body of the cometic atmosphere, the tail of the comet shoots out to an immense distance, sometimes in the form of a narrow, brilliant, and pointed streak of light, sometimes like a faint, uniform and homogenous column, sometimes bifurcated and even divided into three or four branches, and sometimes it diffuses a pale and hideous glare over a fourth part of the heavens.†

* That the celestial spaces are perfectly void, and that the repulsion, which Mr. Oliver maintains does not arise from the atmospheres comingling with each other, is not only supposed by him, but attempted to be demonstrated.

† According to Justin a comet appeared one hundred and thirty years before Christ, the light of which was so terrible that it embraced the whole heavens.

In short, this hypothesis is altogether untenable, and we have spent perhaps more time than was necessary in pointing out its defects, but we thought some attention was due to a tract, which has found its way into Europe and has been noticed with considerable respect, and is now republished at a time, when the curiosity, that is awakened, may lead to some inquiry on this subject.

We wish now that it was in our power to offer to the curious a just and satisfactory account of this singular appendage of comets; but we confess, that after patient and diligent search, we can find but little substantial information respecting it. The explanation, which appears to be incumbered with the fewest difficulties, supposes that the tails of comets are composed of the very light substance of their atmospheres, highly rarified by the heat of the sun, and elevated partly by the impulse* of the solar rays, and partly by the sun's atmosphere. On this supposition the tail is a hollow cylinder, or frustum of a cone, and ought to appear more bright near the edges, than along the middle, as is frequently observed. The undulations, which are sometimes noticed, as also the sudden extinction and reappearance, and other phenomena of the tail, like what we observe in the aurora borealis, are ascribed with great probability to changes in our

* The momentum of light which is here taken for granted, we acknowledge has not been so satisfactorily proved as we could wish, although it is rendered highly probable, from the powerful action, which it exerts upon the retina, from its being turned out of a rectilinear course by passing near the sharp edge of a body, from its communicating sensible motion to light substances, such as films of amianthus, when it is condensed by a burning glass. An experiment has also been made, in which it was made to act by a very powerful lens upon the beam of a balance, made of the wire of a harpsichord, and placed under a glass receiver; the motion of the balance was very apparent, but it is not quite certain, whether this arose from the impulsive force of light or the rarification of the air. The most formidable objection to the admission of this principle is the necessary diminution of the sun's body, occasioned by this copious and constant emanation. La Place however has determined, that the sun's loss cannot have amounted to a two millionth part of his substance in the last two thousand years; and that although the mean motion of the planets would be accelerated by the impulse of his light, the effect would be much more than destroyed by the diminution of the sun's mass.

own atmosphere.* The variations in the appearance of the head however, which have led some to suppose two or three bodies united, are thought to arise from something like clouds in the atmosphere of the comet. The explanation here given is substantially that which is adopted by Pingré† and La Place; and is evidently far from being inconsistent with that of Newton, for he says expressly,‡ “Without any great incongruity we may suppose that in so free spaces, so fine a matter as that of the æther may yield to the action of the rays of the sun’s light, although those rays are not able sensibly to move the gross substances in our parts, which are impeded by so palpable a resistance.”

We now return to consider a remark of Dr. Winthrop, with regard to the natural effects, which comets may be intended to produce; and we are somewhat surprised that he should entertain so mean an opinion of the rank and relative importance of these bodies in the solar system. “It does not seem very likely,” says he, “that they should be intended, as the planets, to afford an habitation for animals, but it is most probable that they are designed to be some way or other serviceable to the planetary worlds.” Similar sentiments, indeed, have been expressed by others. Dr. Herschel, after mentioning several comets discovered by his sister, that appeared to consist of mere vapour, condensed about a centre without any nucleus, (probably owing to the thick atmosphere, which enveloped them,) observes:—“This circumstance throws a mystery over the destination of comets, which seems to place them in the allegorical view of tools, probably designed for some salutary purpose to be wrought by them, and whether the restoration of what is lost to the sun, by the emission of light, may not be one of them, I shall not presume to deter-

* The comet of 1759 had no visible tail at Paris or not more than 2°, whereas, at Montpellier it extended 24°.

The tail of the comet of 1607 appeared short for a little while, and then in a moment shot up very long. In the case of the comet of 1618 the rays of the tail had the appearance of being agitated by the wind.

† See *Cométographie*, tom. ii. p. 217. also *Système du monde*, p. 121.

‡ *Prin.* l. iii. p. 41.

"mine." Some have assigned to these bodies the task of bringing back those floods of electrical matter, which are supposed to be continually sent off into the regions of space by the planets. Others again have considered them designed, as houses of correction for impenitent transgressors; but the more common and favorite opinion is, that they are destined to furnish fuel for the sun.

Now as this is a subject, on which every one may guess, we take the liberty to dissent from all such opinions. We cannot help considering them as nearly allied to those very old ones, which supposed the earth to be the only considerable object in the universe, and the sun, moon, and stars, as designed solely for its use.

After the study of some thousands of years, men were compelled to admit, that the earth, which we inhabit, is but a planet,* like those little bright bodies, which move among the stars. This was a great step, and once taken, the subsequent progress was comparatively easy and rapid. But as we have extended our views we have regularly sunk in the scale, while the objects around us have as constantly risen. Comets have but lately been introduced to us, and we have no doubt, that a more intimate acquaintance will lead to a better opinion of them. It is not yet three centuries since they began to be observed with attention, and we have already a catalogue of more than one hundred, among which not more than three or four can fairly be considered as different returns of the same comet. Beside these, since the commencement of the Christian era, we have accounts of about three hundred and thirteen,† that may be relied upon.

* No longer ago than in the time of Galileo, that venerable philosopher, at his second citation before the inquisition, was compelled, by the terrors of that tribunal, to sign the following formula of abjuration:—"I, Galileo, in the seventieth year of my age, brought personally to justice, on my knees, and having before my eyes the holy evangelists, which I touch with my own hands, with a sincere heart and faith I abjure, curse, and detest, the absurdity, error, and heresy, of the motion of the earth."

† Whole number of comets down to 1651 according to Riccioli 154.

Do. 1665 do. Lubienietzki 415.

From the commencement of the Christian era, down to 1783, according to Pingré, 380.

What deduction is to be made for returns, it is impossible to say. But from the elements of those, with which we are acquainted, from the circumstance of every new comet differing in its orbit from those before known, also from the duration of the periodic revolutions of those, whose return has been recognised, which we cannot but suppose are among the shortest, for such would be likely to be first known: from all these considerations, it is evident, that the periods of comets must be very long and of course the real number to be inferred from all the appearances, of which we have any knowledge, proportionally great. If now, in addition to all this, we consider that there are many, which entirely escape our notice, notwithstanding all our vigilance; first, from distance and feebleness of light, as we seldom see any in the hemisphere opposite to the sun; secondly, from such a proximity to the sun as never to appear above the twilight;* thirdly, from a long course of bad weather or the light of the moon, which sometimes eclipses them; and lastly from such a position of their orbits, as does not admit of their appearing above the horizon in those places where observations are taken; it is evident, that the number of comets must be very great.

Let us now see what we can learn of their magnitudes. The comet of 1759, at its former appearance, was found, by the observation of Flamsteed, to have a diameter equal to that of Mercury. The comet of 1744 is said to have subtended an angle of one minute, when at the distance of the sun, and of course must have had a diameter equal to three times that of the earth, and a magnitude twenty seven times as great. Several others, according to the best observations, must be considered as holding a rank, in this respect, but little inferior to the smaller primary planets. Beside, if former accounts are to be depended upon, we have not yet had an opportunity of making exact observations upon the most remarkable. We find in the history of comets, that there is mention made of several, which shone with such a lustre as to be

* A comet is said to have been seen in the year 60 during a solar eclipse.

visible in the day time;* a circumstance, in which an observer could not very well be deceived, and concerning which he would not be likely to misrepresent. One of these is particularly described as very much resembling the moon, when obscured by a thin cloud. Several are described as expelling the darkness of the night, and even rivaling the sun in splendor. After the death of Scipio Africanus, a comet appeared which is said to have "occupied nearly a fourth part of the heavens with its light, and almost to have bedimmed the brightness of the sun."

In the summer of 1454 a remarkable comet appeared, which is represented as "passing between us and the moon, producing an eclipse of that luminary, according to the customary manner in which those phenomena take place.†

Séneca has given us an account of a comet, "which," he says, "was not inferior to the sun, and which burst forth a little before the Achæan war. It was at first fiery and red, emitting a clear light, by which it conquered the darkness of the night."‡

But we have evidence still more decisive in proof of the very great apparent magnitude of some of these bodies, in the ample account furnished us of one, which appeared no longer ago than 1652, and which was very carefully observed by Hevelius himself; and several other astronomers in Europe. Hevelius says, that at first it appeared under an angle of about 30', that is, little less than the sun or moon; that it grew less and less for about twenty days, when it disappeared. Fully aware of the distrust, with which accounts of such wonderful phenomena are received; he enters into a minute description of the magnitude, figure, colour, and every circumstance attending this prodigy. He states most explicitly that the whole head of this phenomenon exhibited an equal light, not faint toward the

* The comet, which appeared about the time of Julius Cæsar, the first of 1402, that of 1618, that of 1744, and several others, are said to have been visible in the day time.

† Pingré says "this account is attested by one eye witness of sound judgment. The thing is not impossible in itself. If it is true, we conclude that comets have very little density, for it did not disturb the earth or moon." *Cometog.* tom. ii. p. 152.

‡ *Nat. Quest.* Lib. 7. c. 15.

limb, but presenting a well defined disc, easily traced by the naked eye.*

When therefore we consider, that the number of comets, in all probability, does not fall short of four or five hundred,† and that the magnitude of some of the less conspicuous and remarkable, raises them to an equality with the smaller planets, when we consider also that they are governed by the same laws, and make a part of the same system, is it consistent with reason and a just analogy to suppose, that a class of bodies, so numerous and majestic, was created to be the mere tools and servants of half a dozen planets, especially as they do not come in sight of them more than once in two or three centuries, and then do not approach within many millions of miles? As to the opinion that they are employed to bring back light and electricity, it is very difficult to conceive, without mentioning the awkwardness of such a contrivance for collecting and transporting fluids so subtle and impatient of confinement, when and how they are to dispose of their cargoes, and in what manner those precious articles are to be carried through such immense spaces, as still intervene between us and the nearest approach of a comet. The case is particularly perplexing when applied to electricity, as a vacuum is found to be the most perfect nonconductor of this fluid, which it should seem ought even to prevent it from ever leaving us, and so far supersede the necessity of these carriers. But it will be said perhaps, that there are not equal objections to comets being subservient to the sun, and that some provision must be made to meet the vast expense, to which this luminary is subject. To this it may be answered, that we know too little of the constitution of the sun to infer a priori the necessity of any such supply. And were we satisfied on this point, it is far from being clear that comets are exactly suited to the purpose. It is not easy to conceive how these gross bodies are capable of

* Hevelii Cometog. p. 324.

† Struyck, upon a kind of computation not to be relied on, supposed the whole number about one hundred. Others have fixed it at three hundred. They have been generally estimated at about five hundred. La Place says they probably do not exceed a million.

being manufactured into a substance so ethereal as light. From the proximity of the comet of 1680 to the sun, and its supposed elevation of temperature to a degree two thousand times greater than that of red hot iron, we should expect, if it were composed of matter in any considerable degree combustible, that it would have taken fire, and become a little sun of itself. But there is no evidence that its appearance after passing the sun was essentially different from what it was before. Still however it may be said, that this comet must ultimately fall into the sun from the operation of known principles, it having already entered into the sun's atmosphere, the resistance of which must continually make it approach nearer and nearer, till at length it is precipitated upon the sun's body. This is by no means necessary, for we find that the orbits of the comets are materially changed by the influence of the planets, and this effect of the solar atmosphere may be effectually counteracted by disturbing forces, which other comets are known to have experienced.

Indeed all these conjectures are founded upon vulgar analogies, where the circumstances of the cases compared are out of all proportion to each other. Because the sun gives light and heat, we presume that it must be a great body of fire, and like other fires must be continually fed. But its light and heat are found to be pretty uniform, although we know of no instance, in which there has been an accession of combustible matter. Those who recollect the heat of the last summer, will be satisfied that there is at present no want of fuel, although the comet, which lately visited us, appears to have contributed no part of it.

But there is another view of this subject, which perhaps will raise comets still higher in our estimation. It will appear upon a slight attention, that the distinction, which at first view seems to be so wide and manifest, is not so well grounded as we are apt to suppose; and we may perhaps have the mortification to find that we are more nearly related to these bodies, than we have imagined; so much so at least, as to lay us under an obligation to treat them with more civility.

We would now ask, in what consists the mighty difference

between a planet and a comet? Not surely the position of their orbits, or the direction of their motion; for these can in no respect affect the constitution of the body, or the condition of its inhabitants. Nor, indeed can it be the circumstance of having or not having an extensive atmosphere, or a long train of light appended, since many of these bodies, which we call comets, have appeared without any tail, or beard, but with a disc as round, well defined, and clear, as that of Jupiter. And as to dulness of aspect, and thickness of coma, the new planets of Piazzi, Olbers, and Harding,* for such we continue to call them, notwithstanding Dr. Herschel's attempt to detrude them from the rank, these planets have atmospheres very much resembling those of most comets. Beside, it is thought by very good judges, that the aurora borealis, to a spectator on one of the other planets, would appear under the form of a tail, like those which belong to comets.

But it will be very confidently asserted, that eccentricity of orbit constitutes an essential and most important distinction,

* As little information is to be found in books of astronomy relating to these newly discovered bodies, the following summary needs no apology. The planet Ceres was discovered by Piazzi, astronomer royal of Palermo in Sicily, January 1, 1801; Pallas by Dr. Olbers of Bremen, March 28, 1802; Juno by Mr. Harding of Lilienthal, near Bremen, September 1, 1804. Vesta by Dr. Olbers, March 29, 1807. It will be seen from the annexed table, that these four bodies are in some respects distinguished from planets and from comets, while at the same time they have some features in common with each, and evidently form an intermediate grade, so that some astronomers have hesitated to which class to refer them. To settle this dispute, Dr. Herschel proposed to separate them from both under the new name of Asteroids. The following is the order of their distances from the sun; but the reverse of that in which they were discovered.

	Vesta.	Juno.	Pallas.	Ceres.
Distance from the sun } in millions of miles. }	217.	255.	266.	266.
Periods in days,	1169.	1582.	1683.	1683.
Eccentricity.	0.0953.	0.25.	0.2463.	0.097.
Inclination to the ecliptic. }	7° 8' $\frac{1}{2}$.	13° 50'.	34° 39'.	10° 37'.
Diameters in English } miles. }		100.	110.	161.

that must bar these intruders from our society, and keep them at a respectful distance. It is indeed true, that there is in this respect a very great difference; but we shall notwithstanding be surprised to find on examination how nearly they approach to each other, when we compare the most eccentric of the planetary orbits with that which is the least so, among the comets. Indeed we may form a geometrical series, each term representing the ratio of the eccentricity to the mean distance, which shall rise without interruption from the planets to the comets, and connect them together in the same progression. But the planets, which have been recently discovered, seem to be filling up the chasm; and it is not improbable, that future discoveries will so multiply these intermediate objects, and render the transition from one to the other so imperceptible, that the distinction between these two great classes of bodies, which has hitherto been considered as so just and well founded, shall appear to have arisen entirely from overlooking intermediate links, and bringing into comparison remote parts of the same chain.

But there are many, who are willing to admit, that comets hold a place of some respectability in the system, though a subordinate one, who have yet so much humanity, that they know not how to consign beings, endowed with sense and reason, to such dreary abodes. They are distressed for the poor creatures, that may be destined to experience such terrible extremes of heat and cold, of light and darkness. And it is not their fault, that the situation is not more tolerable, for they have labored very hard to make it as comfortable as possible, and after all, have left it but a sorry residence. Now we candidly confess, that we have the barbarity to feel none of this compassion for the cometarians, any more than for the poor fishes that know nothing of the comforts of a dry lodging and a good fire. Every one knows, that the tropical regions were once thought too hot, and the polar circles too cold, for the habitation of man. Indeed it would be very difficult to conceive, were we not convinced of the contrary by fact, that animals could be so constituted, as to live in the water, under ground, and in a vast variety of situations, that would be fatal to man. Since then we find that the air, earth, sea, every element, and every climate

teems with life and enjoyment, will not analogy justify the belief, that comets are also peopled with inhabitants, who are very well satisfied with their condition, and would not thank us for our fancied improvements, however they might commend our good wishes? But if men will have it, that the cometarians shall not exist, unless they will condescend to use our thermometer, philosophy furnishes us with means abundantly sufficient to accommodate them with a temperature to their liking.

In the first place then, even if we admit the materiality of heat and its actual emanation from the sun, it is well known, that the sun is not the only source of heat; that at a certain depth below the surface of the earth, the temperature is moderate and constant; that most animals are so constituted, as to furnish a supply of heat suited to their nature and wants; and that there are artificial means of procuring it, in almost any quantity we please.

But it will be said, that all these means are derived ultimately from the sun, that his influence is essential to the growth of vegetables, and even to the fluidity of the air we breathe. Granting all this, we see no reason why comets may not at all times have an abundant supply of the sun's beams for every purpose of this kind. Indeed without supposing that comets have a source of heat in themselves, which seems not altogether improbable, from the observations of Dr. Herschel; yet, since the developement of heat, even through the medium of the sun, depends so much upon the nature of the substance acted upon, the constitution and density of the atmosphere in which it is placed, and a variety of other circumstances; since it is well known, that in the latitudes of 40° and 50° the oppressive heat of 98° or 100° is sometimes experienced, while snow and ice on the mountains under the line remain congealed; since we are exposed to sudden transitions of 30° or 40° without being able to assign any adequate cause; since also the comet of 1680, as well as others, retain their atmospheres after passing the sun in a state very similar to what they were before, which, on the supposition of such an intense heat as some have supposed, must have been dispersed to the remote parts of the system; all these circumstances duly considered, we see no reason in the world why

comets may not be provided with any temperature, which we may choose to give them.

There is considerable ingenuity, though not much novelty, in the suggestion of Mr. Oliver in his second essay, that the extremes of heat and cold may be very much moderated by a variation in the density of the atmosphere, which surrounds the comet; more especially as it has been found, that caloric may actually be expressed from the air by condensation in such quantity, as to set fire to combustible bodies; as also that the opposite effect is produced by rarefaction.

This supposition derives additional confirmation from discoveries relative to the slow propagation of heat through fluids. And as the atmosphere of a comet is very thick and extensive, frequently equal to the space comprehended between the earth and the moon's orbit, it is not improbable, that a considerable part of a revolution may be necessary for the heat thoroughly to penetrate through a medium so dense and extensive, and that there may not be a greater variation of temperature on the surface of the comet, than what takes place at the bottom of the ocean on the earth. Nor will this altogether prevent those cool breezes, which Mr. Oliver supposes are constantly blowing towards the parts most exposed to the sun's heat from the opposite hemisphere, similar to those which are found so refreshing in countries adjacent to large bodies of water.

As to the article of light, we do not see but that some of the cometarians, during a considerable part of their year, must be under the necessity of using candles, or be contented with that, which is not much superior to our brightest moonshine. If however, as Dr. Herschel thinks from his observations of the comet of 1807, they emit a light of their own, they may suffer no inconvenience on this account.

But enough of conjecture. For ourselves we want none of the various expedients resorted to, in attempting to render these bodies habitable. We have evidence abundantly sufficient to satisfy us of their habitability, in the innumerable orders of organized beings, that fall under our own observation, and in the ample provision, which is made to render their existence a blessing. It is not only the shortest course, but we

think the most conformable to a just and enlightened philosophy, instead of bringing every thing to our own standard, to admit, that the variety is inexhaustible, that the worlds, which revolve around us, so diversified as to magnitude, aspect, and situation, are peopled with inhabitants equally dissimilar, as unlike in their form and faculties, as the several species of animals, which occupy this earth.

On the whole, we cannot but hope that the view, which we have taken, and the facts and arguments, which we have produced, will serve at least to correct some erroneous impressions, and do away those narrow and unworthy notions, which are still retained by many, relative to the use and destination of so considerable a portion of our system; notions, for the support of which the general scheme of creation offers no legitimate analogy. Were the case put to ourselves, should we not think it very illiberal in an inhabitant of one of those bodies, who, as he travels through the region of the planets, should regard these vast and magnificent orbs, merely as a sort of milestones to mark his progress by, or at best but pleasant objects to relieve the otherwise dull uniformity of his journey; or who should pity the miserable condition of beings, that might be doomed to a sphere so contracted and destitute of variety, while he is favoured with so wide a range, and prospects so grand and diversified; visiting in succession, not only the planets, which happen to fall within our view, but many, to which we are strangers, and occasionally meeting other comets, who bring intelligence from distant and unknown parts, and holding communication either immediately or by means of similar bodies with other suns and other systems. It is by no means difficult to conceive that these wandering stars present not only a comfortable habitation, but the means of improvement and enjoyment, in many respects superior to what we possess.

Still however we cannot help thinking, though we may be chargeable with the same spirit, which we have been opposing, that there is a privilege in having our lot fixed comparatively near the great fountain of light and heat, whose influence is so sensibly felt in the animal and vegetable kingdoms, and that,

limited as our sphere of vision is, it comprehends the better, if not the greater part of the system; at least it affords ample scope for all our faculties. Nay we will go farther, we think that this portion of the system exhibits striking marks of superior dignity; and, if we may be allowed the expression, of a higher state of improvement and civilization; whereas there is something about these comets after all, which gives them the air of rudeness and barbarism. And although we might like, for the sake of the exercise and the scenery, to take an excursion into these wild and uncultivated regions, yet for a constant residence, we should prefer being at least in the vicinity of the metropolis.

We have now a few words to say to another description of persons, who, feeling no concern for the comets, are yet under some apprehensions for themselves. We do not mean such as have yet so much of the spirit of heathenism in them as to ascribe to these harmless, but illfated bodies, those calamities, which both reason and revelation teach us come of ourselves. They are out of our reach. It is in vain to argue against a miracle, real or supposed. But we address ourselves to those who, with some philosophy, apprehend that as the heavens are so full of these comets, moving in all directions, there is great danger of collision; that the shock, or near approach of a comet, would be attended with the most tremendous consequences.

In speaking of our relation to comets, we took no advantage of the opinions of some very learned men, who suppose that some six thousand years ago, this earth itself was nothing more nor less than a comet, involved in an immense cloudy atmosphere, the state of darkness and chaos alluded to in sacred and profane history; that in consequence of passing very near the sun, this atmosphere was refined and purified, while the grosser parts subsided in the form of a crust; that some time after, a comet passing this way, set the earth a rotating upon its axis, whereas before, the day and year were of the same length, and finally, that the same comet, which in 1680 was observed by Sir Isaac Newton, came so near the earth, as by means of the vapour of the tail, and its attracting the waters of the ocean, to produce that great catastrophe the deluge, leaving this before beautiful

planet a melancholy ruin, its atmosphere polluted, and its soil deteriorated, its scanty fruits obtained only by laborious cultivation, and the lives of its inhabitants reduced to a tenth part of their former period.

It is scarcely necessary to mention that these are the opinions of the celebrated Whiston, a man more frequently ridiculed than read, and who displays more solid learning, science, and address, than are generally found in such extravagant speculations.

There are others of a romantic imagination, who have taken prospective views of the changes, to which we may be exposed from the influence of comets. Since the moon produces so sensible an elevation of the waters of the ocean, it is not to be doubted, they think, that the near approach of a comet would raise such tides as would deluge most of the habitable parts of the globe, and by its attraction upon the protuberant matter about the equator, reverse the equatoreal and polar regions. A still less proximity of one of these bodies may, they fear, alter the position of the earth's orbit, and increase its eccentricity to such a degree, as to convert it into a comet, and subject it to such terrible extremes of heat and cold, as would be fatal to every living thing upon the face of the earth. A large and massy comet may encounter the moon with an attraction so much superior to that of the earth, as to carry it off a captive, and leave us to lament its loss; nay, it is not impossible that it may encounter the earth with sufficient power to make prisoners of both. What is possible here, may happen also to the other planets, and we may have the rare spectacle to see a comet seize upon Mars, or Venus, or Mercury, and bear it off before our eyes.

But there is another side to this picture, and those who are more disposed to augur good than evil, may very easily imagine effects of a more propitious aspect.

The disturbing force of a comet may diminish, as well as increase the eccentricity of the earth's orbit, and together with other changes equally possible, may moderate the extremes of temperature we already suffer, and convert the seasons into a perpetual spring. We may also easily suppose a comet to approach us under such circumstances as to be overpowered by

the attraction of the earth, and subjected to the office of a satellite.

But before we indulge imagination any farther, let us see what reason there is for expecting any such changes. The history of astronomy, so far from furnishing any example of this kind, seems to render such an event very improbable. The length of the year, and the variety of the seasons, as well as the condition of the other planets, appear to have suffered, as yet, no material alteration; and we have astronomical observations that extend back more than two thousand years, and accounts of eclipses, and other celestial phenomena of a still more ancient date. We have already had occasion to mention an account of a comet, which is said to have eclipsed the moon; and if it is to be depended upon, the comet must of course have passed very near the earth or moon; yet it is well known, by comparing preceding and subsequent observations, that neither suffered any considerable disturbance. We have also mentioned that the well known comet of 1759 was retarded nearly two years, by the attraction of Jupiter and Saturn, and yet its reciprocal action upon these planets seems not to have amounted to a quantity capable of being estimated. But we have a case still more recent and remarkable. The first comet of 1770* seems by the best observations, and the most profound and elaborate calculations, to have traversed the entire system of Jupiter's satellites, without producing the slightest alteration, and that of all the comets hitherto observed, this has approached the nearest to the earth; and although the period of the comet was diminished more than two days by the attraction of the earth, yet it is ascertained, so

* This singular comet was found by Lexel to have described during its appearance an arc of an ellipse, corresponding to a revolution of a little more than five years and a half; and Burkhardt by a profound examination of the observations of this comet, and the elliptical elements, proper to represent them, confirmed this remarkable result. But, with a revolution so short, this comet ought to have appeared several times; and yet it has not been observed before nor since the year 1770. To explain this fact, Lexel remarked that in 1767 and 1779, this comet passed very near Jupiter, whose attraction was sufficient to diminish in 1767 its perihelion distance, so as to render the comet visible at the earth in 1770, and by a contrary effect in 1779 to increase its perihelion distance, so as to render it invisible afterward. *Mécanique Céleste. Seconde partie liv. ix. ch. ii. and iii.*

far as the best tables are to be relied on, that the length of our year has not suffered an alteration amounting to three seconds. Whence it is concluded by L. a Place, that the mass of this comet is less than one five thousandth part of that of the earth; and from all the above facts it is highly probable, that whatever may be the magnitudes of comets, their quantities of matter are comparatively small; and so far from producing such important revolutions as those which have been suggested, judging from what we know, they do not appear calculated to annoy us in any considerable degree, or even to injure the accuracy of our astronomical tables.

Still it may be said, that a much greater comet may approach us, and approach much nearer, and even impinge upon the earth; and that such an event would undoubtedly be followed with the most disastrous consequences. All this is physically possible; but then it supposes such a concurrence of circumstances, as places it so near the limits of impossibility, that it is difficult to estimate the difference.

The comet of 1680 has been thought to threaten the earth with more danger than any other. Dr. Halley concluded, from a rough calculation, that at the nearest approach of this comet to the earth's orbit, the distance amounted to a semidiameter of the sun, or, adds he, in a parenthesis, to the radius of the moon's orbit.* But it has since been found, by the more rigorous calculations of Pingré and M. du Séjour, that the nearest distance of this comet from the earth's orbit, was very nearly double the distance of the moon from the earth.† And how small the chance is that these two bodies will arrive at these two points at the same time, we may judge in some degree by considering that the comet passes this point only once in five hundred and seventy five years; at which time it is about as 300000 to 1, that the earth, that is, the centre of the earth, will not be within one thousand miles of the point of greatest ap-

* Dr. Halley's determination of the nearest approach of this comet to the earth's orbit, has sometimes been erroneously stated; the semidiameter of the earth being substituted for the semidiameter of the sun, 4000, instead of 400000 miles; a mistake which may have led to some groundless apprehensions. See Rees' Cyclopædia, article "Comet."

† Cometographie, tom. ii. p. 166.

proximation; of course so near an approach as this cannot be expected to take place more than once in 300000 times 575, or about one hundred and seventy millions of years.

On the supposition of a variation of the perihelion distance, and a change in the position of the orbit, the doctrine of chances has been applied to this subject, with a view to determine what degree of probability there is of a collision of a comet and a planet. M. du Sejour has shown, that even admitting such changes as should cause the path of a comet to intersect that of the earth, the chance in favor of the comet's being in this point at that precise juncture is nearly as one to infinity. Likewise the chance in favor of the earth's being in that point, is nearly as one to infinity. Not only therefore are two occurrences necessary, of which each is almost infinitely improbable, but it is also necessary that they should take place at the same time, in order to produce the event in question.

But there are considerations, which might be suggested, of a higher nature and better suited to allay any undue apprehensions, arising from the marks of wise contrivance and benevolent design, which become more and more conspicuous the further our views are extended. The circumstance of the planets, among which we are placed, moving all in the same direction and having the planes of their orbits so nearly coincident, a condition attended with advantages fully known only to those who have studied them, is a case not to be accounted for upon the doctrine of chances; it is the result of intelligence and foresight; and we may rest assured that the same Being, which has formed and so nicely adjusted this immense and complicated fabric, will not abandon to chance the work of his hands, but will so direct and superintend its movements, as best to promote the great and benevolent purpose of its creation.

We would now lay before our readers such particulars, as we have been able to collect, relating to the present comet and that of 1807, had we not already extended this article to a much greater length than we at first intended. We therefore refer our readers, for such particulars, as well as for much valuable information of a more general nature, to the appendix annexed to the volume just published, containing Dr. Winthrop's

Lectures and Mr. Oliver's Essays. We cannot however forbear congratulating ourselves and the public on the very early determination of the elements of the orbits of both these comets, as announced by Mr. Bowditch of Salem.* It is now a long time since we had the satisfaction of seeing these results of Mr. Bowditch, as respects the comet of 1807, confirmed by those of some of the first astronomers in Europe; and although we have had too many proofs of the skill and accuracy of this distinguished mathematician to admit of any doubt of the correctness of his conclusions respecting the present comet, yet we were not a little gratified upon finding how remarkably they agree with those of the celebrated Burckhardt,† as it may tend to silence a pretender, who has presumed to call in question not merely the correctness of particular elements in Mr. Bowditch's calculation, but the justness of his whole view of the subject.‡

* *Elements of the orbit of the comet of 1807.*

Time of passing the perihelion.	Long of the perihelion.	Perihelion distance.	Long. of node.	Inclina- tion	
d. h. ' "	s. ° ' "		s. ° ' "	° ' "	
Sept. 18 19 18 34	9 00 59 55	0.64962	8 26 25 3	63 09 57	Bowditch.
19 6 56	9 00 56 53	0.647491	8 26 39 40	63 14 01	Bouvard.
18 22 10	9 28 41	0.64802	8 26 36	63 15	Galvin Low.

Motion direct.

Elements of the orbit of the comet of 1811.

d. h.	s. ° ' "		s. ° ' "	° ' "	
Sept. 12 3	2 15 14	1.032	4 20 24	73 06	Bowditch.
12 9 48	2 14 12	1.02241	4 20 13	72 12	Burckhardt.

Motion retrograde.

According to Mr. Ure of Glasgow this comet passed its perihelion Sept. 9, at which time its distance from the sun was 94,724,360 miles; comet's distance from the earth September 15, 142,500,090 miles. Length of the tail at the above time 33,000,000 miles. The angle, which it subtended, is not mentioned. These results, as is evident, differ very considerably from the corresponding ones above. The above times are for Greenwich, except those of Bouvard and Burckhardt, which are for the meridian of Paris. The difference is 9' 19".

† The curious problem respecting the comet of 1770 before mentioned, was proposed as the subject of a prize, by the National Institute, and the prize was awarded to Burckhardt.

‡ It may be necessary to inform some of our readers, that we allude to certain strictures of a Mr. John Wood, on Mr. Bowditch's calculations, which Mr. Bowditch has condescended to answer in a manner that we think must be very satisfactory even to the gentleman concerned.

ARTICLE 4.

Self-Control: A Novel. 2 vols. 12mo. Philadelphia, Farrand, Hopkins & Zantlinger, 1811. Boston, 1 vol. 12mo, 1811.

His warfare is within.—There unfatigued
 His fervent spirit labours.—There he fights,
 And there obtains fresh triumphs o'er himself,
 And never-withering wreaths, compared with which
 The laurels that a Cæsar reaps are weeds. COWPER.

THAT a second edition of this book should be published, within three months of its first appearance in the country, shows that it has excited much interest, and we wish we had so much confidence in the public taste, as to believe that its having been much read, was a proof of its merit. But the appetite for works of mere amusement is indiscriminating. If our community has justly admired Crabbe, and Southey, and Scott, it has also applauded the weak Montgomery, and the effeminate and contemptible Moore; and if quite sufficient praise has been given to Miss Porter, the value of the tribute is very much diminished by the endurance and even approbation of Miss Owen's sentimental lasciviousness. It is to be much regretted, that there are so many readers, who have so little regard to the means by which they seek amusement; who are pleased with any book, which pictures strong emotions, caring very little what is the character of their sympathies; for we are continually less alive to repeated impressions, and the grossest applications will at last be necessary to excite the appetite languid from indulgence. There are some novels also, whose authors seem to aim to confuse our ideas of virtue, and to destroy the definiteness of the boundaries of right and wrong. They picture characters, whose natural qualities, as generosity, courage, or susceptibility, cannot but please, and describe the proper indulgence of these dispositions, as consisting in acts of extravagance, rashness, or folly, forgetting that restraint and government is virtue, and that feelings may be innocently possessed, which it will be criminal to indulge. Or they attribute to their heroes some powerful and absorbing affection, and this is usually love, which they softly censure, yet represent as irresistible.

ble; and although it should cause the neglect of all duty, and destroy all common feeling, and propel to what is criminal, yet temptation is described in such glowing colours, that it seems hardly wrong to yield; we are induced to pity as misfortunes what we should consider the punishments of vice, and forget that no elevation of passion can destroy the obligations, which are common to all. The effect of being thus deceived into love of characters, in which there is nothing estimable, and induced to excuse and pity vice, or admire only that for the possession of which no one deserves praise, must be to destroy the niceness of moral discrimination. There are other no less unnatural delineations of characters of excelling goodness, whose feelings are all benevolent, who are uncontaminated by any of the common habits, which degrade weaker humanity. The most uncommon occurrences, the most dazzling deeds of virtue are the events of their lives, and these are accompanied by griefs that might rend the soul of sympathy, and joys that agonize. But if virtue is always represented as splendid and commanding, the relish for humble and domestic excellence will be lost, and if we are taught to sympathize only with elevated and refined pleasures, the common enjoyments of life will be insipid, while real pain will not be less felt, because the sufferer has cultivated a taste for elegant misery and sentimental woe. But as evil is generally produced by the perversion of the means of good, fictitious histories, though they may have held up a false standard, insinuated noxious principles, excited bad passions, and vitiated the taste, and cherished feelings already too uncontrolled, may sometimes have increased the love of virtue, quickened the moral discernment, conveyed lessons of conduct, and been of great use in teaching that most important science, the knowledge of character. As novels however are generally read for mere amusement, to prevent vacancy, and to relieve fatigue, the mind is usually passive under the impression of their sentiments, or if at first vigorous, is soon enervated by their debilitating influence. And the most assiduous readers are the young, ready to receive but unable to discriminate; easily pleased and excited, and unsuspecting that what is beautiful may be injurious. It is then of the

greatest importance, that they be free from every thing that can vitiate moral sensibility, from every thing that will inflame passion, or increase the difficulty of self-government, from all representations of pleasure, which will be in vain desired, from all trifling with the emotions of compassion, by descriptions of misery and want, in which suffering alone appears, while squalidness, and disease, and vulgarity, their almost necessary and loathsome accompaniments, are unnoticed. Perhaps no class of writings have more effect upon the morals of the age than novels, and it is unfit that these powerful agents should be arrogantly employed by any one, who has invention or imitative power sufficient to plan a story, and words enough to make sentences. We often wish that in these authors the desire of doing good was better directed, and that vanity would be satisfied with a less ample field for display.

Self-Control, though without a name, we presume to be the production of a female. The author declares herself, in a dedication to Miss Joanna Baillie, to be "a person, whom nature, fortune, and inclination have alike marked for obscurity." Now as we do not like disqualifying speeches, we were not much prepossessed in her favor, by this ostentation of modesty. She declares that she was desirous of doing good, and therefore she published a novel, which she wrote for amusement. How she intended to execute her purpose may be seen from the following passage of the dedication.

"In the character of Laura Montreville the religious principle is exhibited as rejecting the bribes of ambition; bestowing fortitude in want and sorrow; as restraining just displeasure; overcoming constitutional timidity; conquering misplaced affection; and triumphing over the fear of death and disgrace." p. 4.

How the author has executed her purpose we proceed to consider. The story is this,

Captain Montreville was a half-pay officer. He resided in Scotland. He had married a woman of fashion, because he was in love, and she accepted a man below her rank, because Montreville was handsome, and she wanted a husband; and this, like most love matches, was very sad in its event. Laura was his only child, and she is introduced to us, when seventeen

years old, just after the death of her mother, which was by no means a thing to be lamented; for Lady Montreville had grown nervous, and she vexed her husband; and peevish, and she tormented her daughter; so that the former lost only a customary stimulus, and the latter an object of care and endurance. Near Glenalbert was stationed colonel Hargrave, who was very rich, and very handsome, and who, having a peerage in prospect, was an object of admiration with all the ladies in the kingdom. He had seen Laura, was enamoured of her person, and for a year had been striving, by the display of his graces and powers, to secure so much of her love as would fit her for his purposes. The first scene in the book represents him offending Laura, who had acknowledged her fondness, by his base proposals. As soon as he believed her to be serious in her resentment, his passion got the better of his pride, and he made offers to her father of marrying her. She rejected him, however, for she was now undeceived as to his character, and determined to overcome her affection. Here commence her efforts at *self-control*. With the small property, which captain Montreville possessed, he had purchased an annuity for his daughter's life, and as payment was now refused because of some informality of the deed, a journey to London became necessary, and Laura accompanied her father. The evening before they set out, she had an interview with Hargrave, in which he made the most lover-like protestations, and by varied appeals to the fears and affections of Laura, now promising amendment, and now threatening most desperate measures, declaring that if she would not forgive him, he would drown his love in dissipation, and even hinting that he would hang himself, and thus that upon her would be the death of his body and soul, at last persuades or compels her to promise, that if for two years his habits were correct, she would then think about his being again her friend. Hargrave was quite satisfied, and he bought Blair's sermons, and began to go to church, and determined to be very discreet in his gallantries. Meanwhile Laura and her father arrive in London, and here they are detained by various difficulties in settling the affair of the annuity. Their landlady had two daughters, one of them was short,

round, and ugly; and much to the annoyance of Laura, was very full of tender sentiment. The descriptions of her rhapsodies, though there is in them somewhat of caricature, are rather amusing: the other was married to a quiet little plebeian, Mr. Jones; and a conversation, which took place on a visit to them, we will extract, for we think it as lively as any part of the book. In the narrative of an expedition which Mr. and Mrs. Jones had made to the highlands, some mention was made of the herrings, which are caught in Loch Lomond.

“‘Kate,’ said Mr. Jones, setting down his tea-cup, and settling his hands upon his knees, ‘you know I think you’re wrong about them herrings.’ ‘Mr. Jones,’ returned the lady, with a look that shewed that the herrings had been the subject of former altercation, ‘for certain the waiter told me that they came out of the loch, and to what purpose should he tell lies about it?’ ‘I tells you, Kate, that herrings come out of the sea,’ said Mr. Jones. ‘Well, that loch is a great fresh water sea,’ said Mrs. Jones. ‘Out of the salt sea,’ insisted Mr. Jones. ‘Ay,’ said Mrs. Jones, ‘them salt herrings as we gets here, but it stands to reason, Mr. Jones, that the fresh herrings should come out of fresh water.’ ‘I say, cod is fresh, and doesn’t it come out of the sea? answer me that, Mrs. Jones.’ ‘It is no wonder the cod is fresh,’ returned the lady, ‘when the fishmongers keep fresh water running on it day and night.’ ‘Kate, it’s of no use argufying, I say herrings come out of the sea. What say you, Sir?’ turning to Captain Montreville. The Captain softened his verdict in the gentleman’s favor, by saying, that Mrs. Jones was right in her account of the waiter’s report, though the man, in speaking of ‘the loch,’ meant not Loch-Lomond, but an arm of the sea. ‘I know’d it,’ said Mrs. Jones, triumphantly, for haven’t I read it in the newspaper as Government offers a reward to any body that’ll put most salt upon them Scotch herrings, and isn’t that what makes the salt so dear?’ So having settled this knotty point to his own satisfaction, Mr. Jones again applied himself to his tea.”

The person, to whom the money for the annuity had been paid, was dead; his heir, Mr. Warren, was a fop, and a man of pleasure; and having seen Laura, he formed designs respecting her, which were quite in character. Warren, pretending a commission from her father, whom he had drawn from the house by a promise of settling his business, persuaded Laura to ride with him, and would have carried her out of the city, but

"Laura rose from her seat, and seizing the reins with a force that made the horses rear, she coolly chose that moment to spring from the curricie" This amazonian achievement would have excited our wonder, had we not been before apprized of the alarming size of our heroine.—"Her height was certainly above the beautiful, and perhaps exceeded the majestic." This description resembles in extravagance that of her eyelashes, which were such, that when "she raised her mild, religious, dark, grey eyes, they rested on the well-defined, but delicate eyebrow; and when her glance fell before the gaze of admiration, they threw a long shade on a cheek of unequalled beauty, both for form and colour." After all this we could easily have imagined that "the contour of her features, inclining to the Roman, might perhaps have been called masculine." But we are nevertheless to believe that Laura was very beautiful, for we are elsewhere told, that she was a person of "matchless simplicity and consummate loveliness."

Laura is now represented as enduring distresses, which seldom befall an individual, with a keenness of feeling, undiminished by exercise. She had the care of her father, suffering from dangerous illness, occasioned by his alarm at the absence of Laura with Warren, whose character he had just discovered, or from hypochondriac depression, constantly foreboding and complaining; she supplied his wants by her labors in painting, in which she was skilled; and she is exposed to the passionate ravings of Hargrave, who had followed and found her, and who, as he grew more dissolute, was more anxious for a speedy union, urging his suit with a terrifying fervor, being seconded by the intreaties of her debilitated father. Her only friends, Mrs. De Courcy and her son and daughter, with whom she had become acquainted by means of her paintings, had left the city, and Montague De Courcy had ceased his visits, fearing the increase of an incipient passion, which circumstances prevented his indulging. Alone and enfeebled, she suffered the loss of her father, and the prospect of poverty appalled her. In this destitute state she was received, as a companion, by Lady Pelham, a half-sister of her mother, to whom, on account of some family dissensions, she had been before unknown.

Relieved from the fears of poverty and the persecutions of Hargrave, and elevated to be the associate of rank and fortune; as the niece of Lady Pelham, Laura was for a while insensible to the new vexations which awaited her. In her aunt she found a most assiduous tormentor. She received Laura because she wanted a companion, and Laura would be a very cheap and very useful one, and as she was handsome, would be known and admired, and thus Lady Pelham's disinterested generosity would be acknowledged. She had persuaded herself that her only motives were benevolence towards Laura, and the desire of having some object to fill the chasm in her affectionate heart, which was made by the elopement of her unnatural daughter with a young ensign, whom she never could forgive. Her kindness to Laura, she expected would be repayed by the endurance of her ill temper, and she seemed to value her principally as an object on which to exercise her power of tormenting. The casual mention of one of the most profligate actions of Hargrave, had so affected Laura, as to cause a long illness, and the melancholy which remained, and was caused by the conviction that she must no more have any hope with regard to him, excited the curiosity of her aunt, and was a theme of unceasing hints and inquiries. In the spring they removed to her Ladyship's seat at Walbourne near Norwood, the residence of her friends the De Courcy's, who are represented as hospitable, and benevolent, and cheerful, and to whom she often resorted for relief from the society of her aunt. Hargrave, discovering her abode, again appears as the friend of Lady Pelham, declares to her his pretensions and wishes, and intrigues with her to secure the compliance of Laura, who decidedly declared to her aunt her determination to persist in her rejection, while to Hargrave she conducted with coldness and aversion. The entreaties and commands of Lady Pelham, her threats, and promises, and abuse; the visits of Hargrave, at which she was compelled to be present; the reports of her absolute engagement, and all the plans which could be devised to overcome her decision, had no other effect, but to distress and mortify Laura. Their removal again to London, where she hoped to be free from Hargrave, did not bring the expected relief.

Admitted to familiar acquaintance with her aunt, Laura was exposed to his passion when she was alone, and to offensive freedoms before others. For a short time the manner of Hargrave was changed from ardor and extravagance to civility and respect, and Laura congratulated herself on the alteration. But it only lasted while an unsuccessful attempt was made to involve her by gaming, when he again was wild and furious in his addresses. Such was his influence with Lady Pelham, and her desire that he should succeed, that she contrived at a scheme, by which Laura was to be arrested for a pretended debt, and Hargrave to relieve her upon condition of future kindness. His designs were much more atrocious than were confided to Lady Pelham, and the detection of the plot roused the indignation of Laura at the baseness of her aunt, which she could no longer doubt. To appease her anger, and prevent her departure to her friends in Scotland, her Ladyship immediately removed to Walbourne.

Montague De Courcy had concealed his love, because his fortune would not permit increased expense, until he had made that provision for his sister, which his father had intended, but neglected. Her marriage to one of the most respectable and sensible men mentioned in the novel, was the cause of an avowal on his part, which produced a rejection by Laura, for she was not yet entirely freed from the dominion of her imagination, and believed that she could not return the love which was offered. Her intimacy with De Courcy was not indifferent to Hargrave, and the final success of De Courcy's suit inflamed him almost to madness. He hated the man, of whom he was jealous, and resolved that force should obtain what his persuasions would not. But the regiment, to which he belonged, with Hargrave at the head of it, were now ordered to America, and the news of his departure at length relieved Laura from apprehension, and left her to indulge in happy anticipations. Another event, not much less propitious to her peace, also took place, which was the death of her aunt by apoplexy. We hoped that here the unfortunate Laura's troubles were to cease, and she was to arrive at the fate of all heroines, that she was about to be married, have a great many children, and live a

long and happy life. But alas! our author was determined upon having at least one original incident in her book, and seems through the remainder of it as though she had written herself into an extacy, for the purpose.

One evening as Laura was returning from Mrs. De Courcy's, she is seized by ruffians, transported in a carriage with closed blinds, with most indescribable celerity, to the sea-coast. She made one unsuccessful attempt by the way to jump out of the window, and in her despair she hid a penknife in her bosom. She was now put on board a vessel, and carried to America. In the wilds of Canada, far from human habitations, her nearest neighbours the Indians, she is placed in an house, which we presume was made for the purpose, there to await the arrival of her most devoted Col. Hargrave. She resolves however to commit suicide, provided there should be any necessity. But she is saved from her very disagreeable dilemma, by the carelessness of her maid, who left her alone, while walking. She espies a canoe, embarks, and is carried by the stream down the river. She moves on till the next morning, when she performs a most terrible exploit, no less than sailing down a cataract, which it is to be supposed was exceedingly high. She finds herself, when recovered from the uncomfortable effects of her adventure, in a respectable house. Hence she obtains a passage for her native country, and after arriving there, every thing goes on precisely as if she had not gone to America at all. As for Hargrave, he thinking Laura was drowned, shoots himself.

Thus much for the narrative. The incidents are most of them trite, and some are ridiculous. We were inclined so to consider the attempt of Hargrave, to seize Laura in the house of her aunt, in broad day-light, notwithstanding all the apparatus of connivance and strategem, by which it is attempted to make it appear credible. And where would not our author's love of the marvellous have carried her, when it induced her to send her poor heroine over the Atlantic, to the wildernesses of Canada. It would, indeed, be no objection to the novel, if by the triteness of the incidents, we meant such as occurred every day in real life, but we mean what is very different, such as oc-

our every day in novels. The conduct in any imagined situations may be represented as perfectly correct, the example to any one in similar circumstances fit to be exactly followed. But of however general application the moral or practical principle that is deduced may be, its impression cannot be so great upon us, if we believe it to be impossible that we should ever be in such circumstances, as if we thought ourselves continually liable to be placed in them. Many have respected the decision of Alexander at the Granicus, or of Cæsar at the Rubicon, and have admired the fortitude of Regulus, but perhaps few have imitated these high examples in the familiar actions of common life. So too *Æsop's* fox tormented by flies presents a very excellent example of patience, but we suspect that there have not been many, who have been more quiet in suffering on account of it.

With the manner, in which the incidents are related we were in general pleased, notwithstanding many faults. Somewhat of wit and repartee is displayed, yet the attempts at humor are often awkward. There is sometimes an unpleasant obtrusion of the author's self; there are frequent trifling vulgarities of style, and some slight inaccuracies in delineations of character. We were amused by the extravagance of some descriptions, and wondered at the want of judgment in others. Religious observations are sometimes introduced in a troublesome and injudicious manner. A great deal of ornament is not attempted, nor does the fancy of the author appear adapted to figurative embellishment. But her remarks on human nature have often much acuteness. There are passages, which we think have great pathos, and on the whole, there is much interest felt in the characters introduced.

We cannot but approve the intention of the author to recommend habits of self-government, which appears from the character of Laura; for we wish that it should be believed that it is our duty to direct, and not be guided by our feelings; and we are glad that it is the conquest of love, by which this government is exemplified. Not that we consider love a thing in itself the most difficult to be got rid of; not that we should view the man who had overcome indolence, or irritability of temper,

with less respect, than the person who had consented to live, and even to smile, after discovering the unworthiness of a lover; nor that we should consider patience in poverty, and cheerfulness in want, virtues less exalted, than submission to the loss of any object of affection, how much soever the happiness of life might have been thought to depend upon it; but because the representations of love in works of the imagination are generally such as imply that its power is irresistible, that yielding entirely to it is commendable, and that it is worthy to employ many years of life. But love, (in its technical sense, as it is commonly described in novels,) when it has in it any thing of sentiment, we consider only as an alloy of sober friendship; we attribute all the ravings, and extravagances, and vices of professed and desperate lovers, to the impulses of animal feelings. And these representations are dangerous as well as false. They inflame imagination, they cherish passion, and excite expectations of such happiness as can never be enjoyed. As far then as this story, by exhibiting the power of good sense and religion, may counteract the delirious dreams, which may have been produced by "exaggerated descriptions of the happiness of love," and as far as the example which it affords of an attachment which was rational, without any of the wildness of passion, and was strong because it sprung from a soil of virtue, and was firm because its growth was slow, may tend to put love out of fashion, so far we think it deserves praise.

The author has judiciously contrasted the restraining exertions of Laura, with the indulgence and yielding, which characterized Hargrave; and if we think that she has not represented the energy of religion, and the effect of continued endeavours as sufficiently great, we shall not condemn her for the terrible event which she pictures to the undisputed sway of passion.

The passion of Hargrave is opposed to the attachment of De Courcy, and the author has with some correctness marked the difference between the sentiments, which Laura entertained toward each. Hargrave had entirely possessed her soul; she had loved him with somewhat of such devotedness, as he felt for her, though with a purity, which he did not possess,

and without his selfishness. But so calm and rational was her regard for De Courcy, that she could not suspect it was love. She could not for a long time believe, that a mutual desire of pleasing and benefitting, a high estimation of each other's virtues, there being nothing to diminish or counteract their esteem, amounted to any thing more than what was a very insufficient bond of marriage; and our author herself seems almost unwilling to allow that raptures, extacies, and transports, are really unnecessary to prove the strength of attachment. Had De Courcy been described as a little more manly, and not so dependent on smiles and favors, and having less awful reverence for Laura, and not quite so much liability to gloom, the character of a methodist parson would not have been thought by Lady Pelham so applicable.

Lady Pelham is represented as a character of the most devoted selfishness. With some strength she had much narrowness of mind. She was proud, and vexed at every body who was better than herself. Persons whose conduct was a reproach upon her own, by whose virtue she was awed, she did not envy, she did not slander, but such was her native openness, she could not but perpetually speak of their faults, and hint her dislike; and yet her petulance implied that she was sometimes dissatisfied with herself, and sought to transfer her own faults to some one else. She appears to have had a convenient power of thinking herself always in the right, which was yet accompanied with a most uncomfortable uneasiness that every one else should think so too. What she thought the tenderness of her heart, often appeared like ill-temper; her ungoverned and irascible passions were, in her own opinion, only strong and quick feelings; she had no irritability, but her sensibility was always alive; her perfect generosity was most frequently manifested by her easy reception of favors, and her delicacy, by her unwillingness to return them. Thus she is described, as living upon opinion, and therefore desiring power, as this implied superiority, and as she had not taste or capacity for attachment, she was pleased that others should be dependent on her. Lady Pelham is said to have had wit, liveliness, and information; and when every body pleased her, why she

would please them. But if at some times her vivacity delighted, at others, the ebullitions of her indulged passions were degrading and offensive. When she dared to expose herself, her malice seemed diabolical, and no trifle could escape her censure, or if fear restrained her, she relieved herself from even apparent good humor, by provoking hints and inuendos. In the delineation of this character, by the descriptions of the means and influence of self-deception, and of the expressions of ill-temper and vanity, we think the author has discovered knowledge of human nature.

We can give the same praise to the descriptions of captain Montreville's melancholy. When afflicted with this disease, he appears weak in mind and indolent in body; ill-tempered, irritable, and selfish; depressed, and not roused by misfortunes; tormenting himself and others by anticipations of increased calamity, and refusing every thing that might enliven.

"Wilfully and without effort he suffered his spirits to expire. His whole train of thinking became habitually gloomy. He was wretched even without reference to his situation, and the original cause of his melancholy was rather the excuse than the reason of his depression." p. 175.

And this is precisely the manner in which he should have appeared.

On the whole, we have been pleased with *Self-Control*. If we have sometimes been made to laugh, where it was not intended, we have never been angry; and if we could not admire, we could often approve.

INTELLIGENCE.

UNDER this head we propose, among other articles, to publish such interesting information as we may obtain respecting the universities and colleges in our country. From our vicinity to the university of Cambridge, we shall be able, we presume, to give intelligence particularly relating to this institution.

We have received an account of the provision made by the late Hon. Samuel Dexter for promoting a critical knowledge

of the holy scriptures, which we have no doubt will be acceptable to a large portion of our readers.

Dexter fund at Harvard university.

THE donor of this fund was one of "the memorable men of our country."* He retired from mercantile business in Boston, when thirty six years old, and was afterwards in important public stations. For the last thirty years of his life he declined these employments, and gave much of his time to study; and particularly to theological inquiries. He died in the summer of 1810, in the eighty fifth year of his age. He bequeathed five thousand dollars to Harvard college, for promoting a critical knowledge of the scriptures. The part of his will relating to this bequest is here published.

Extract from the will.

"Being myself firmly persuaded, that if the Christian religion be but well understood, it cannot fail of convincing every sincere inquirer of its divine authority; and recent deistical publications, as well as many of a more distant date, rendering it evident that revelation is rejected because some of the historical, doctrinal, or preceptive parts of the holy scriptures, or parts of each, are misapprehended by unbelievers; the reading of whose writings tends to shake the faith of such as are unable to detect their mistakes—difficulties started seeming to many insurmountable, however superficial they really may be and may appear to be to persons well acquainted with the original languages—which difficulties would vanish, were the passages objected to critically and judiciously rendered and explained: and it being also apparent, that the nature and degree of the inspiration attributed by the most rational Christians to the sacred writers, are, with respect to some of them at least, wrongly conceived of by the enemies of revealed religion.

"I do therefore give and bequeath to the President and Fellows of the University in Cambridge, in this Commonwealth, for the benefit of said University, and the increase of that most useful branch of learning, the critical knowledge of the holy scriptures, the sum of three thousand three hundred thirty and three dollars thirty and three cents and four mills; to be paid in one year and an half after my decease; the same to be put out and kept on interest, on good security, both *personal* and *real*; by which I mean, that two responsible persons, at least, shall give bond, jointly and severally; and that there shall be executed a deed of mortgage of lands,

* See biographical notice of the late Hon. Samuel Dexter, in the *Monthly Anthology* for July, 1810.

that may without difficulty be rented, free from any incumbrance, as collateral security for payment; which lands shall be of three-fold the value of the sum mentioned in the condition of the bond: and my will is, that the interest be applied according to the following directions.

"The first year's interest, and that of other years as expressed in the sequel, I appropriate to the purchasing from time to time, for the library of said University, translations of the bible already published, not yet possessed, or that may be published, or translations of the Old or New Testament separately, or of any portion or portions of one or the other—learned commentaries and explanations, profound remarks, and in general of any books, or manuscripts of any country or language, and of whatever description, which may be judged useful in promoting a critical knowledge of the holy scriptures, and for forming by degrees a complete biblical apparatus, whereby sacred criticism may be further improved, and progressively carried on towards perfection.

"It is my desire that the President and Fellows of the University elect three gentlemen of the clergy, and two others, not of that order, to join with the corporation in the management of the interest that may grow out of this fund, according to the directions already given, and those which are yet to be added: and my will is, that three clerical, and two lay gentlemen be at all times associated with the corporation for this purpose; which is to be understood as a matter, not interfering with, but entirely distinct from the professorship of divinity in the University, saving that the professor will be eligible, as a clergyman, into the association, or occasionally, as a lecturer, for the design which will be presently offered to view.

"The interest of the second year, and of others, as will soon be mentioned, I devote to the promotion of the knowledge of the sacred writings, principally of the New Testament, in such a way as cannot ordinarily be practised in mixed assemblies of Christians on Lord's days; which yet may tend greatly to the improvement of men of contemplative minds; especially of such students in divinity as may be desirous to become critics in biblical literature, that they may thereby be rendered more extensively useful in the church of God. It is therefore my desire that the corporation and their elected associates, institute time and place for the delivery, in each of those years, of one learned dissertation, or more, if they see fit, for the purpose of *critically* explaining either the *history*, *doctrines*, or *precepts*, of the gospel; and of each in such order, as shall be judged most likely to be profitable, and as suitable lecturers for each can be provided: not omitting elucidations of such parts of the Old Testament as have by the most judicious *expositors* been thought to be prophetic of the *advent*, or to refer to the *character*, or offices of the Messiah, or to the events consequent upon his divine mission. Peradventure while the believer is illuminat-

ed, the sceptic may be convinced. My meaning is, that only some selected part of sacred history, some particular doctrine, or precept of the gospel, or except where one cannot be disjoined from another, some single prophecy of the coming of Christ, some individual prophetic description of his person, or of his religion, or of its effects, should be the subject of any one lecture.

"My will is, that two hundred sixty and six dollars and two thirds of a dollar, the annual interest, be applied the first year in which it may be received for purchasing books, or writings, for the library; and the next year after for defraying the expenses of critical lectures for promoting scripture knowledge, and so on in a regular change, and reciprocal succession.

"Provided nevertheless, that as the lecturers ought to receive a compensation, and a large number of their discourses should be published, if the corporation, and the five gentlemen associated with them, (I mean both here and elsewhere, a majority of the whole body,) should judge it best that the first year's interest, appropriated to the support of lecturing, should be put out on interest, and that there should be no public discourse delivered till two years' compound interest of the capital sum shall have been received, their judgment shall determine this question. But should they thus judge, it is not to be understood to be my desire that the whole of the five hundred forty and nine dollars and one third of a dollar, then in hand, should at all events be expended in that same year. A gradual increase of the capital, when a part of the income can at times be well spared, without injuring the design of the testator, would be desirable: and to this end also it will be of importance that no monies should lie unnecessarily in an unproductive state. These things however are left entirely to the prudence and wise conduct of the managers.

"Provided moreover, that if at any time, or times, when interest shall have been received, or may be receivable, a learned person shall have written, or shall be engaged in writing a critical treatise, disquisition, or commentary, of the same useful tendency, in the judgment of the associated managers, too lengthy to be read at any public meeting—or if, when it shall be thought that circumstances are become sufficiently propitious, and that advantages fully adequate to the undertaking are possessed, any learned man shall be employed about a new translation of the New Testament, or of any part or parts of the same, or of such part or parts of the Old Testament as are referred to above, the corporation and the gentlemen associated with them, may interrupt the ordinary course of proceeding, and apply a part, or the whole of any money received for interest, as an aid towards printing and publishing such treatise, disquisition, commentary, or translation, if it should appear to them fit and proper so to do. When, however, a sale of the copy-right will effect the same design, this use of the money will be needless.

"After all that has been said above, the corporation and their associates will not fail to observe a disposition in the testator to leave *very much* to their discretion. He was influenced thereto from a persuasion of his own incompetency for determining their proceedings with precision. His great object is to promote a *critical* knowledge of the holy scriptures; but he is not so tenacious of the plan he has exhibited, as to be against any deviations from it; provided the important purpose of the bequest be strictly adhered to. The scheme presented may be superfluous in some respects, and defective in others. To the superior wisdom of the worthy and respectable characters, who may practise and improve upon it, but above all to the blessing of God, he commends a design so imperfectly delineated."

Note.

"March 27, 1800.

"It has occurred to me, since the execution of my last will and testament, that it may be imagined by some, that the design of the legacy to the university implies in it an apprehension that the reverend and learned gentlemen, the President and the Professor of Theology, the learned and worthy Professor of the Hebrew and Oriental languages, and the great body of the clergy in this commonwealth, are remiss in their attention to the object of the legacy. I earnestly disavow the implication. Indeed, while with an enthusiastic ardor I was penning that part of my will, I had no room for the idea. My mind was wholly occupied with a wish that the religion of the gospel, which the more I studied the more I was confirmed in the belief of its truth, might be better understood; that unbelievers might be proselyted, and doubters confirmed. Upon the occurrence of the thought, however, I was led to revise the article in my will; the result of which revision is, that I am very sensible it might receive amendments. The method proposed respecting the subjects of the public discourses might be altered for the better. I think I could meliorate it myself; but I shall not attempt it. I have submitted all matters in a great measure to the discretion of the managers; and to remove all cause for censure, I now beg that the bequest may be considered as if I had said but little more than that I left such a sum for promoting a *critical* knowledge of the holy scriptures. No one will deny that this is a very important object. Every one will allow, that he who wishes for no more religious knowledge than will barely suffice, never improves, as he ought, the small stock he is possessed of, or he would desire more. No proficient in biblical learning will say that sacred criticism is arrived at perfection. It will be improving till believers 'shall know even as they are known.' The study of the gospel and its precedent and subsequent relations, is 'drawing water out of the wells of salvation,' which are inexhaustible.

"Upon the whole, I leave the matter nearly as much at large as if the bequest had been made in two lines as above; not doubting if

there are suggestions in my plan that may in some measure be helpful they will be recurred to. My object will be well known from what I have written, though I may not have been happy enough to lay a wise scheme for carrying it into effect; and this object I earnestly wish may be pursued. The thought that I had done *nothing* by proposing it, which eventually might have some effect in promoting the interest of the divine religion of the gospel, the declarations of which lie at the foundation of my own hope respecting a future existence, would give me uneasiness in the latest moments of my life.

"P. S. The directions respecting the placing and keeping at interest the legacy, and the election of associates with the corporation, cannot be dispensed with, but must remain absolute, notwithstanding any thing said above. They cannot be discretionary.

"It is impossible that the usefulness of explaining idioms, phrases, and figures of speech, which abound in the scriptures; and the usages and customs therein referred to; and of clearing up the difficulties in sacred chronology and geography, should not be adverted to by the managers of the legacy.

"I certify that the above written are correct copies of the original bequest in my own hand writing, dated February 12, 1799; and of the note directed to be communicated to the corporation, dated March 27, 1800, with a postscript.

"I also certify, that on the 9th of October, 1802, I wrote and executed a short codicil, adding one thousand one hundred and eleven dollars eleven cents and one mill; and that on the day of 1809, I wrote and duly executed a second codicil in order to add five hundred and fifty five dollars fifty five cents and five mills, thereby making an aggregate sum of five thousand dollars to be applied *solely* and entirely to the promoting of a critical knowledge of the holy scriptures, as expressed in the original bequest, and subject, *mutatis mutandis*, so far as may be approved by the corporation and their associates, to the directions given in the same, yet renewing and confirming the discretionary powers in their fullest latitude of construction as therein also expressed.

"SAMUEL DEXTER."

The fund thus bequeathed being received in May last, the corporation proceeded, according to the will, to elect associates, who with the President and Fellows constitute the Trustees of the fund; and they are the Hon. Samuel Dexter, Hon. Artemas Ward, Rev. John Bradford, Rev. James Freeman, D. D. Rev. William E. Channing.

As a first measure for accomplishing the objects of the foundation, the Trustees determined upon "the election of a suitable person to deliver a course of lectures on this founda-

tion, the subject to be biblical criticism; the lecturer to treat of its necessity and importance to a right understanding of the scriptures and the best manner of pursuing it; pointing out a course of study in this department of sacred learning. He will also answer objections to biblical criticism, with remarks on its history and present state." The delivery of the lectures is to commence at the college so soon as the lecturer shall have prepared his course; within a period not exceeding two years from the time of his election; and the delivery of the whole course to be within three months from the time the first lecture is given. There shall be paid to the lecturer a sum not less than three hundred dollars.

The Rev. Joseph S. Buckminster of Boston was in the month of June last chosen first lecturer.

THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION AT CAMBRIDGE.

THE number of resident Graduates, studying divinity at the College having much increased, some new arrangements have been made for their benefit. Heretofore the theological students had pursued their studies with the advantage of the Library, and public lectures of the College, and with such advice as they might seek. Their superintendence had been the duty of no one. The president, the professor of Divinity and professor of Hebrew and Oriental languages now afford the instruction, which they can give consistently with their primary obligations to the undergraduates. Professor Willard assists them in the study of the Hebrew scriptures. The critical interpretation of the Greek testament is pursued under Dr. Ware: general references are furnished by the Professor, and the attention of the students is not confined to any text book. The President directs their inquiries on the principal subjects of natural and revealed religion, by proposing questions for examination, with references to books to be consulted.

As the system adopted requires an easy access to many books, the corporation have placed at their disposal the dupli-

cate Theological works of the college library. These have been deposited in a reading room, at all times open. Among these books are the following copies of the scriptures; The London Polyglott, The Hebrew Bible with the Massorah, The first volume of Kennicott's Hebrew Bible, Grabe's Septuagint, Wetstein's New Testament. There are several valuable Concordances and Lexicons; among which are Taylor's and Buxtorf's Hebrew concordances, Frommii's concordance for the Septuagint, and Stephens' for the Greek of the New Testament, Robert Stephens' Latin Thesaurus, Henry Stephens' Greek Thesaurus, Pagninus' Hebrew Thesaurus, and Schindlers' Pentaglott Lexicon. There are many works on the interpretation of the scriptures, some of which are rarely to be met with in this country: such as, those of Le Clerc, Grotius, Lightfoot, Poole, Wolfius, the Fratres Poloni, Mede. The following may be a specimen of other theological works. Either the whole or parts of the works of Barrow, Chillingworth, Bishop Burnett, Josephus, Bull, Arminius, Bochart, Le Long, Father Simon, Hoadly, Lardner, Stillingfleet, Sykes. Besides these works, and others of a similar nature, there are many good editions of the works of the fathers.

The privileges of the graduates in the college library have not been diminished by this arrangement, but any books which are there may still be borrowed or consulted.

MEDICAL DEGREES.

SOME new regulations have lately been made with regard to the conferring of medical degrees by Harvard University. The following are the statutes now in force on this subject, with a note relating to it.

" 1. Candidates for the degree of Doctor in Medicine must attend two courses of the lectures of each of the medical professors in this University, and also their clinical practice in medicine and surgery during the lectures. They must study two years under the direction of a regular practitioner of medicine, and allow a third to elapse before they can be examined.

Provided, however, that in extraordinary cases the medical professors, with the consent of the President, may dispense with the attendance on one course of lectures on such conditions as may be thought reasonable.

" 2. Those who have not received a university education, shall satisfy the President and medical professors of their knowledge in the Latin language, and in experimental philosophy.

" 3. The candidates shall enrol their names with the Secretary of the Faculty of Medicine, immediately after the termination of the winter courses of lectures. The examinations will commence on the second Wednesday following, and be continued from time to time until all the candidates have been examined in Anatomy, Surgery and Midwifery; Theory and Practice of Medicine; Chemistry and Materia Medica; and Clinical Medicine. In extraordinary cases, the faculty, with the consent of the President, may examine at other periods.

" 4. Each of the candidates approved shall prepare an inaugural dissertation on some medical subject, which dissertation having been submitted to the Faculty of Medicine, at least fourteen days before, shall be read and defended at a public examination in the Philosophy Chamber at Cambridge, on the Friday preceding the last Wednesday in August, in presence of the governors and instructors of the University, and such members of the Massachusetts Medical Society, and other individuals, as may choose to attend.

" 5. If the Faculty approve the dissertation, they shall then signify their approbation of the candidate to the President, to be laid before the SENATUS ACADEMICUS, who, finding him entitled, will admit him to receive the degree of Doctor in Medicine, at the ensuing commencement.

" 6. All those who have heretofore obtained the degree of Bachelor in Medicine, at this University, will receive the degree of Doctor in Medicine.

Cambridge, March 21, 1811.

" *Note.* The lectures designed for medical students, are given in Boston, under the direction of the University, during the winter, in the following branches, viz. Anatomy, Physiolo-

gy, Surgery, and Midwifery; Theory and Practice of Physic; Chemistry and Materia Medica; and Clinical Medicine. At the same place is the clinical school in Medicine and Surgery. The lectures designed for the senior class at the University, are given in the Spring at Cambridge. It is recommended, but not required, that Medical Students who have not received a College education, should attend the lectures on Natural and Experimental Philosophy, which are given at Cambridge, three or four times in a week from April to August. Candidates for a medical degree are also advised to attend the course on Botany, which is given at Cambridge during the Spring and Summer.

The fee to be paid for the degree of Doctor in Medicine is twenty dollars.

The Secretary of the Faculty of Medicine is JOHN C. WARREN, M. D. Adjunct Professor of Anatomy and Surgery.

BOWDOIN PRIZE QUESTIONS.

THE following are the Bowdoin prize questions and prizes for the present year.

" 1. The art of printing, with a comparative estimate of its advantages and disadvantages, in reference to the interests of truth and virtue.

" 2. The nature and principles of taste, considered generally, or with special reference to literary composition.

" 3. The origin of the masoretic points, and their subserviency to a thorough knowledge of the Hebrew language.

" 4. The nature of virtue and moral obligation.

" 5. Natural history and experimental philosophy, considered as sources of instruction and entertainment.

" Six premiums will be assigned, if so many dissertations of sufficient merit shall be offered. To the authors of the three best dissertations, upon either subject, will be given thirty dollars each, or the first medal; and of the three next best dissertations, twenty dollars, or the second medal. The

performances must be in the hands of the president, by the middle of June, 1812.

Harvard College.

The above questions may be written upon by resident graduates, and by undergraduates.

LIBRARY OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

ABOUT seven hundred and fifty volumes have been added to the Library of Harvard University, since the Commencement in 1810. Many of the works added are very rare and valuable; and of these we shall give some particular notices in our next number.

SCHLEUSNER'S LEXICON.

WE announce with very great pleasure the intended publication of an AMERICAN EDITION OF SCHLEUSNER'S LEXICON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT by Mr. Hilliard of this place. There is no person acquainted with this most valuable work and who has at heart the promotion of the cause of sacred literature, who will not feel a strong interest in this design. In the studies of biblical criticism and the interpretation of the scriptures, the scholars of our country (at least of this part of it) have in proportion to their means and opportunities kept pace with those of the most enlightened parts of Europe. They have lately at least participated in all the advantages derived from those vast improvements in respect to these studies, which have been made principally in the last half century, and which have given new views and a new direction to men's pursuits in these subjects. We know of no work, the republication of which would be more honorable to the literary character of our country, than that, which is now proposed, and none which could by any means so essentially contribute to encourage and facilitate the attention, which has been awakened among us, to the most important studies before mentioned. The theological student not possessed of this Lexicon labors under a great and almost

irremediable disadvantage compared with one, who has it in common use. It contains, in a condensed form, a great part of the most valuable information respecting the interpretation of words and sentences in the New Testament, and the scholar, who has it in his library, may without inconvenience dispense with many voluminous works from which this information has been collected. From its arrangement as a Lexicon, what it contains may at once be found, and all the important passages, in which any word or phrase occurs, are collected under one head, and may be compared together. Under a very large proportion, indeed, of the principal words, all the passages in the New Testament in which they occur are produced, so that this work may, beside its other uses, in a great measure supply the place of a Greek Concordance of the Christian scriptures. Herbert Marsh, in his notes on Michaelis, after adding to the enumeration given by that author of writers who have illustrated the language of the New Testament by means of the Septuagint, Josephus, and the Greek classics, adds; "Many other authors might be mentioned, who have illustrated the language of the New Testament: but it is unnecessary, as Schleusner's Lexicon contains every thing, which is valuable in them." Michaelis, vol. i. p. 449. In another place he gives the following character of it.

"This work contains a treasure of knowledge, with which no student in theology can dispense: it unites the most valuable observations, which Lightfoot, Schoettgen, and Meuschen have made from the works of Hebrew and Rabbinical writers, those which Carpzov and Krebs have made from Philo and Josephus, those which Raphel, Bos, Alberti, Elsner, Kypke, Palaiet, and Münthe have made from the Greek classics, together with an immense number, which the author's own profound erudition supplied. The different senses of the words are investigated with the utmost philological precision: they are illustrated by the principal passages of the Greek Testament; and the whole is arranged in the most perspicuous manner." Notes to Vol. III. pp. 5, 6.

We will add, though of less value, the testimony of the learned Adam Clarke, whose Commentary on the Bible is now republishing in this country. In one part of his Bibliographical Dictionary, [vol. vi. p. 240.] he calls it "an elaborate, accurate,

and excellent work, far before every thing of the kind yet published." In the article devoted to this work, he makes the following remarks upon it.

"This is the completest work of the kind ever published. The literal meaning of each word is accurately given—the different acceptations it has in all parts of the New Testament carefully exhibited—and those uses of the words illustrated and vindicated by quotations from the best Greek writers. The author has availed himself of the labors of all preceding lexicographers on the Greek Testament, and in this department of literature has left little to his successors to supply."

The publication of a work of this kind, which will conduce so much to the honor of our country, as well as to the promotion of theological knowledge among us, should be patronized, not only by the scholars, for whom it is particularly intended, but by the rich and munificent. While we are called upon to exercise our liberality for the translation of the scriptures into the languages of the East, it may be expected that at least an equal share of it, and, from the judgment with which the liberality of our men of wealth has been usually exercised, perhaps a somewhat more than equal share, will be bestowed for the promotion of the knowledge of the scriptures among ourselves. The expense of the publication will be great, and a liberal subscription, (of at least five hundred subscribers,) must appear before it can be commenced.

The gentleman who undertakes the publication, Mr. Hilliard, is, it may be recollected, one of the publishers of the Cambridge edition of Griesbach,* and from the accuracy and fidelity with which that work has been executed, we have a pledge that the same will be found in the present. Every exertion will be made, to produce a correct reimpression. There has been lately, a new edition published in Germany, which will be procured as the copy for the present.

We have before us, the second German edition, (1801) in two thick octavo volumes, consisting in the whole of 2660 pages. The American edition will be published in a much more convenient form, that of 4to.

* It is in fact very creditable to his press, that a number of copies of this work have been sent out for by the London booksellers.

MARSH'S LECTURES.

✓ **HERBERT MARSH**, since his appointment as Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, has commenced a course of Lectures, of which he delivers and publishes six annually. Of these two Parts have appeared. The title is "A course of Lectures containing a description and systematic arrangement of the several branches of divinity, accompanied with an account, both of the principal authors and of the progress, which has been made at different periods in theological learning." Part I. 1809. Part II. 1810. Of the first Part a few copies only were received in our part of the country: Of the second Part, we have seen but one copy. The Lectures, which have already appeared, Mr. Hilliard proposes to republish, and to continue the republication of the other Parts, as they may come out in England.

The very high reputation of their author will, without doubt, produce an interest in this publication. Whatever may be their other merits, these Lectures contain a very accurate and very valuable compend of knowledge on the subjects, which have already been treated, the Criticism (in its technical sense) of the New and of the Old Testament.

 FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

(Selected from the latest British publications, which have been received; to October, inclusive.)

NEW PUBLICATIONS:

CHRONOLOGICAL Retrospect, or Memoirs of the principal events of Mahommedan history from the death of the Arabian Legislator to the accession of Akbar, and the establishment of the Mogul empire in Hindustan. Translated from the Persian Authorities, by Major David Price of the Hon. East India Company's service. Vol. 1, 4to.

The History of Scotland during the reign of Robert, surnamed the Bruce, by R. Kerr, F.R.S. F.A.S. 2 vols. 8vo.

Hakluyt's Collection of the early voyages, travels, and discoveries of the English nation, has been republished.

A Journal of a Tour in Iceland, in the summer of 1809; by William Jackson Hooker, F.L.S. and member of the Wernerian society of Edinburgh.

Dr. Smith, the President of the Linnæan society, has published from the original manuscript journal of the celebrated Linnæus, *Lachesis Lapponica*, or a Tour in Lapland. 2 vols. 8vo.

Thomas Macgill, author of *Travels in Turkey*, has published an account of Tunis, its government, manners, customs, and antiquities, especially of its productions, manufactures, and commerce. 1 vol. 8vo.

Sir John Carr has published a new book, *Descriptive Travels in the southern and eastern parts of Spain and the Balearic isles in the year 1809.* 4to.

Geological Travels, Vol. i. ii. iii. containing travels in England; by J. A. De Luc, F.R.S. Translated from the French.

Observations on mineralogical systems; by Richard Chevenix, Esq. F.R.S. Translated from the French. 8vo.

Transactions of the Geological society, vol. i. 4to.

Memoirs of the Wernerian Nat. Hist. Soc. vol. i. for the years 1808-9-10. With fifteen engravings. 8vo. pp. 644. 1811. This society is established at Edinburgh. In the printed list of members, say the Reviewers, "we perceive only three *honorary*, namely Professor Werner, Sir Joseph Banks, and Mr. Kirwan; forty three *resident*, seventy nine *non-resident*, and an hundred *foreign*."

Secret Strategetical Instructions of Frederic the Second, for his Inspectors General. Translated from the German by captain C. H. Smith. 4to. 18 printed pages, 31 plates. *Strategics*, as used by captain Smith, is the science of military movement beyond the visual circle of the enemy, or out of cannon shot; *Tactics*, the science of military movement, executed in the presence of an enemy so as to be actually in his sight and within the range of his artillery. Of these instructions there is likewise a French translation.

Recherches sur la Force de l' Armée Française. a Paris, 8vo.

A Letter upon the mischievous influence of the Spanish Inquisition, as it actually exists in the Provinces under the Spanish government. Translated from *El Espanol*, a periodical Spanish Journal.

Three Numbers of the *American Review* have been republished in England.

Robert Smith's Address has likewise been republished.

Walter Scott is republishing Lord Somers' Tracts with valuable additions and two supplementary volumes. 6 volumes have been published.

The *Harleian Miscellany* has likewise been published by the late William Oldys, Esq. with some additional notes by T. Park, F. S. A.

John Richardson, Esq. F. R. S. has published a Grammar of the Arabic language, in 4to. Printed uniformly with Sir William Jones' Persian Grammar.

H. T. Colebrooke, Esq. has published *Cosha*, or a Dictionary of the Sanscrit language, by Amara Senha. 4to. Likewise *Two Treatises on the Hindoo Law of Inheritance.* 4to.

The XIth Volume of the *Asiatic annual Register* for 1809, has been published.

Mr. Hayter, Chaplain in ordinary to the Prince Regent, and who is the superintendant of the *Herculanean Manuscripts*, which are in England, has published a Report upon these Manuscripts in a Letter addressed by permission to the Prince Regent; and is preparing several of them for publication at the Clarendon press.—[In the year 1752, thirty nine years after the discovery of *Herculaneum*, a large number of manuscripts were found in the remains of an house, conjectured to have belonged to L. Piso. Many of these were destroyed by the workmen, before it was known what they were. About eight hundred however were preserved. The unrolling and decyphering of these, a work of much ingenuity and labor, was begun under the patronage of the Neapolitan government. But very slow progress however had been made when the Prince of Wales requested and obtained permission of the

Court of Naples, that the work should be carried on at his expense and under his direction. In consequence of this permission Mr. Hayter was sent out in the year 1802. About eighty manuscripts were then unrolled and copied. At the time of the invasion of the French, when the court of Naples fled to Sicily, the papyri (as they are called) not yet unrolled were left behind. The eighty copies above mentioned were carried to Sicily and have since been obtained and sent to England. They are the manuscripts, which Mr. Hayter now proposes to publish.—Before his arrival at Naples one manuscript only had been published in 1793, a Treatise upon music by Philodemus the Epicurean. This publication is in the Athenæum at Boston. It contains, first the work itself in two parallel columns, the one exhibiting in a *fac simile* the letters of the manuscript as far as they can be discovered, the other the text as supplied by the editors, Mazzochi and Rosini; to this is appended a large body of notes, said to shew great learning and acuteness, for the purpose of justifying and explaining the text, as supplied by the editors. The work itself is said to be of very little value. In 1810 were published *Herculaneensia*, or Archæological and Philological dissertations, by the Rt. Hon. William Drummond and Mr. Robert Walpole. In these appeared the fragments of another work *περί των θεων*, concerning the gods; according to the philosophy of Epicurus. A specimen of the state of this manuscript and a translation of the fragment may be seen in the fifth number of the Quarterly Review. These were the only publications from the Herculanean manuscripts, which till very lately had appeared. It seems however from the following notice, which we extract from the Monthly Magazine for October, that a number of others have since been published, and among them, part of a treatise of Epicurus, which is one of the most valuable works yet discovered. “At Naples the unfolding of the manuscripts found in Herculaneum is continued with great activity. There have been lately published fragments of a Poem on the war between Antony and Augustus; and long extracts from the second book of Epicurus upon Nature. We hope to find the whole treatise. A moral work of Polistocles, a disciple of Epi-

curus has been published. Fragments of Colotus upon Plato and of Coniscus upon Friendship will also be published. An entire new work of Philodemus upon Rhetoric, is in the press."]

Xenophontis quæ existunt opera Greca et Latina, ex editionibus Schneideri et Zeunii: accedit Index Latinus. 10 vol. fools cap.

Euripidis Orestes ad fidem manuscriptorum emendata, et brevibus notis emendationum potissimum rationes reddentibus instructa. In usum studiosæ juventutis. Edidit Ricardus Porson A. M. Græcarum Literarum apud Cantabrigienses Professor, 8vo.

Criseos Griesbachianæ in Novum Testamentum Synopsis. Edidit Josephus White S. T. P. Lingg. Hebr. et Arab. Prof. in Academia Oxoniensi et Ædis Christi Canonicus. 8vo.

Dr. Hutton has published the third volume of his course of Mathematics.

The bishop of Lincoln, Dr. Tomline, formerly Dr. Prettyman, has published a work, which has excited much attention, entitled, a Refutation of Calvinism; in which the doctrines of original sin, grace, regeneration, justification, and universal redemption are explained, and the peculiar tenets of Calvin on those points are proved to be contrary to the scriptures, to the writings of the ancient Fathers of the Christian church, and to the public formularies of the church of England. in 1 vol. 8vo.

Jeremy Taylor's Life and Death of Christ has just been published in 2 vols. 8vo.

Sermons preached on public occasions, with notes and an appendix on various important subjects, by R. Valpy D. D. 2 vols. 8vo.

The National Religion the foundation of national education. A sermon preached in the Cathedral church of St. Paul, London, by Herbert Marsh D.D. F.R.S.

The life and works of Bishop Porteus have been published in 6 volumes, 8vo. by Rev. Robert Hodgson, Rector of St. George's, and one of his majesty's chaplains in ordinary. The Life is said to be well executed, and may be had separate in 1 vol. 8vo.

Mr. Foster has published in an octavo volume, a new edition of his *Essays*, with some alterations and additions.

The Friend; a literary, moral, and political weekly paper, excluding personal and party politics, and the events of the day. Conducted by S. Coleridge, of Grasmere, Westmoreland. Royal octavo, 28 numbers, each 16 pages.

Salmagundi has been republished in London, with an introductory essay and explanatory notes, by John Lambert.

Mrs. Grant has published *Essays on the superstitions of the highlanders of Scotland*; to which are added *Translations from the Gælic*, and letters connected with those formerly published, 2 vols. 12mo.

Ballads, Romances, and other Poems, by Miss Anna Porter, 12mo.

Poems by W. R. Spencer, 8vo.

There have been published, *Letters of Anna Seward*, written between the years of 1784 and 1807. 6 vols. [From some extracts from these letters, which we have seen, they would seem to contain a variety of literary anecdote and criticism. We will give one amusing passage, which happens to be open before us. Miss Seward is remarking on Miss H. More's *Florio*, which she says is sometimes disgraced by vulgarisms, and gives as instances the following lines:

"For face, no mortal could resist her."

And,

"He felt not Celia's powers of face."

"These *face* expressions," says she, "put me in mind of an awkward pedantic youth, once resident for a little time at Litchfield. He was asked how he liked Miss Honora Sneyd, (the lady to whom Major André was attached,) 'O ye powers,' replied the oddity, 'I could not have conceived that she had half the face she has.' Honora was finely rallied about this imputed plenitude of face."]

Mr. Cumberland, just before his death, published a short poem in blank verse, called *Retrospection*, which relates to his own life, and is said in the *British Critic* to be one of the most pleasing of his productions. Some extracts are given from it, which seem in some degree to justify this character.

Oeuvres completes de Madame Cotin, precedées de Memoire sur la Vie de l' Auteur, contenant Malvina, Claire d' Albe, Amelia Mansfield, Mathilde, Elizabeth, et le Prise de Jericho. 14 vols. 12mo.

Fuller's History of the Worthies of England, has been republished in 2 vols. 4to.

WORKS ANNOUNCED.

Dr. Aikin has in the press and will speedily publish in an octavo volume, the Lives of John Selden and Archbishop Usher, with notices of the literary characters, with whom those great men were connected.

James Morrier Esq. secretary of embassy to the court of Persia, has nearly ready for publication, in quarto, a Journey through Persia, Asia Minor, &c. in the years 1808 and 1809.

A Translation of Chateaubriand's Travels (an extract from which was given in the first number of the American Review) in Greece, Palestine, Egypt, and Barbary, in 1806-7; is printing in 2 vols. 8vo.

A Translation of the Continuation of Humboldt's Travels, &c. in New Spain, recently arrived in England, is in the press.

Speedily will be published in 4to. with a number of engravings, Travels in Iceland during the summer of the year 1810, with maps and other plates. This work contains the observations made on this interesting island by Sir George Mackenzie, Bart. Mr. Holland and Mr. Bright. A preliminary dissertation on the history and literature of Iceland will precede the journal of the travellers. In the journal will be described the country, the hot springs, volcanoes, and other natural curiosities; and also the manners and customs of the inhabitants, and it will be followed by distinct chapters on rural, political, and ecclesiastical affairs, on the present state of literature, on natural history, botany, and mineralogy.

The Memoirs of the latter years of Mr. Fox, by his private secretary, Mr. Trotter, are nearly ready for publication.

A life of the late Richard Cumberland by Mr. Mudford is in preparation.

Dr. Tifford has in the press and proposes to publish in six

numbers royal 4to. [The first number to appear last October.] Sketches toward a Hortus Botanicus Americanus, or coloured plates of the West Indies and North and South America, with concise and familiar descriptions, noticing also many plants of Africa and the East Indies, which might be introduced with advantage into the West Indian Islands, compiled during a residence in the West Indies, and a tour through the United States of America.

Professor Playfair has in the press a second edition, with additions and engravings, in a quarto volume, of his illustrations of the Huttonian theory of the Earth.

Mr. Parks has in the press a new and improved edition of his Chemical Catechism.

A history of the Royal Society, by Dr. Thomas Thompson, will be published the ensuing Winter in 1 vol. 4to, as a companion to the recent Abridgement of the Philosophical Transactions. The object of this work is to state the progress of the sciences since the establishment of that illustrious society, and to take a comparative view how much they are indebted to British and how much to foreign cultivation. A considerable portion of biography will find a place in this volume.

Speedily will be published, handsomely printed in four large volumes 8vo. in a uniform size with Mr. Malone's edition of the prose works, the late editions of Spencer, Milton, &c. with a portrait, the poetical works of Dryden, with the notes and illustrations of Dr. Joseph Warton, the Rev. John Warton, and others, and his life by Dr. Johnson.

In the press, an 8vo. volume, Lectures on the Pastoral Character. By George Campbell, D. D. late Principal of Marischal College, Aberdeen. Edited by James Fraser, D. D. Minister of Drumock, Aberdeen.

Dr. Busby proposes to publish his Translation of Lucretius in rhyme, in 2 vols. 4to.

Critical Remarks on Dr. Adam Clarke's Annotations on the Bible, will shortly appear.

M. Gregoire, the famous French Bishop, is preparing a new edition of his work *De La Literature des Negres* (on the Literature of the Negroes) in which he has collected accounts of all their efforts in literature or the arts.

The edition of the Septuagint, begun by Dr. Holmes, is continuing. Dr. Holmes had published the Pentateuch, making one folio volume, and shortly before his death, the book of Daniel, both according to the Septuagint version and that of Theodotion, the latter only having been printed in former editions, because the *Septuagint* version of *this* book is not contained in the common manuscripts, and was unknown, till it was finished at Rome, 1772, from a manuscript belonging to Cardinal Chigi. "Since the death of Dr. Holmes," continues Professor Marsh, (from whose twelfth lecture we extract this notice,) "the continuation of this important work has been conducted by Mr. Parsons, who has properly resumed it, with the historical books, as they follow the Pentateuch; and from the specimen, which he has already given, the book of Joshua, just published, appears well worthy of the task, which has been committed to his care. Every friend of biblical literature must wish to see the completion of this edition."

LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS

FOR OCTOBER, NOVEMBER, AND DECEMBER, 1811.

N. B. All notices of works, published, or proposed to be published, which may be forwarded to the publisher of this work, free of expense, shall be inserted in this list.

NEW WORKS.

• **A** DISCOURSE delivered at Quincy, Oct. 19, 1811, at the interment of the Hon. Richard Cranch, who died Oct. 16, 1811, and of Mrs. Mary Cranch, his wife, who died Oct. 17, 1811. By Peter Whitney, A. M. pastor of the congregational society in that town. Boston, John Eliot, jun.

The substance of three discourses delivered in Park-street church, Boston, by Joseph Buckminster, D. D. pastor of a church in Portsmouth (N. H.) Boston, Samuel T. Armstrong.

A discourse delivered at Reading, north parish, May 19, 1811, in which warnings of death are considered as excitements to review life. By Eliab Stone, pastor of the second church in Reading. Boston, Watson and Bangs.

• A sermon, delivered at Augusta, Oct. 16, 1811, at the ordination of

• The works to which an asterisk is prefixed are in the Athenæum, Boston.

the Rev. Benjamin Tappan, to the pastoral office in that place. By Jesse Appleton, D. D. president of Bowdoin college. Augusta, Peter Edes.

A sermon preached Aug. 11, 1811, for the benefit of the Portsmouth Female Asylum, also with some omissions for the Roxbury Charitable Society, Sept. 18, 1811. By Edward D. Griffin, D. D. pastor of the church in Park-street, Boston. Boston, Munroe & Francis.

* Peace and war, in relation to the United States of America. A discourse, delivered in Boston, on the day of public Thanksgiving in the state of Massachusetts, Nov. 21, 1811. By John Lathrop, D. D. Published at the request of the hearers. Boston, James W. Burditt and Co.

* A sermon delivered in Boston before the Massachusetts Society for promoting Christian knowledge, Nov. 27, 1811. By Rev. Eliphalet Pearson L.L. D. Cambridge, Hilliard & Metcalf.

A selection of approved hymns and spiritual songs, suited to various occasions. For worshipping assemblies, and private families. Newburyport, Thomas and Whipple.

* Fourth vol. American ornithology; or the natural history of the birds of the United States. Illustrated with plates, engraved and coloured from original drawings taken from nature. By Alexander Wilson. Philadelphia, R. & W. Carr, 4to.

A statistical account of the towns and parishes in the state of Connecticut. Published by the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences. Vol. i. No. 1, containing a statistical account of the city of New Haven. By Timothy Dwight, D.D. president of Yale college. pp. 83, 8vo. New Haven, Walter & Steele.

* A brief topographical and statistical manual of the state of New York. Albany, J. Frary. pp. 36, 12mo.

Sketches of a tour to the western country, through the states of Ohio and Kentucky; a voyage down the Ohio and Mississippi rivers, and a trip through the Mississippi Territory and part of West Florida, commenced at Philadelphia in the winter of 1807, and continued in 1809. By F. Cuming. With notes and an appendix, containing some interesting facts; together with a notice of an expedition through Louisiana. Boston, E. Larkin.

* Papers for 1811, communicated to the Massachusetts Society for promoting agriculture. Published by the trustees. Boston, Munroe & French.

* Memoirs of the Philadelphia Society for promoting agriculture; vol. ii. Philadelphia, Johnson & Warner.

A treatise on the law relative to principals, agents, factors, auctioneers, and brokers, by Samuel Livermore, Esq. Boston.

* Thoughts on instinctive impulses. Philadelphia, Jane Aikin pp. 90.

* Catalogue of the books, pamphlets, newspapers, maps, charts, manuscripts, &c. in the library of the Massachusetts Historical Society. Boston, John Eliot, jun. pp. 96, 8vo.

A letter to a great character. Cambridge, Hilliard & Metcalf.

* *The grumbling hive, or the knaves turned honest.* Price 9d. Boston, C. Williams.

* *Beasts at law, or zoologian jurisprudence; a poem, satirical, allegorical, and moral, in three cantos.* N. York, J. Harmer & Co. pp. 104, 12mo.

The trial of Ebenezer Ball, executed at Castine on the 31st Sept. for the murder of Tileston Downes. Castine.

NEW EDITIONS.

Philosophical essays, by Dugald Stewart. New York.

* *Travels in various countries of Europe, Asia, and Africa.* By Edward Daniel Clark, L.L. D. Part the first, Russia, Tartary, and Turkey. Philad. E. Bronson. pp. 610, 8vo.

An inquiry into the causes of the wealth of nations. By Adam Smith, L.L. D. 2 vol. 8vo. Hartford, O. D. Cooke.

Sermons, by Samuel Horsley, L.L. D. F. R. S. late lord bishop of St. Asaph. 8vo. New York, T. and J. Swords.

The rules and exercises of holy dying. By J. Taylor. pp. 388, 18mo. Philadelphia, W. W. Woodward.

Junius' Letters. Pocket edition. Cambridge, Hilliard and Metcalf.

Elements of astronomy, designed for the use of students in the university. By Rev. S. Vince, A. M. F. R. S. Philadelphia, Kimber and Conrad.

Trigonometry, plain and spherical, with the construction and application of Logarithms. By Thomas Simpson, F. R. S. with an appendix on spherical projections. Philadelphia, Kimber & Conrad.

An introduction to Algebra, by John Bonnicastle. Philadelphia, Kimber and Conrad.

A compendious Hebrew Lexicon, adapted to the English language, and composed upon a new and commodious plan; to which is annexed a brief account of the construction and rationale of the Hebrew Tongue. By Samuel Pike. 2d Cambridge edition, Hilliard and Metcalf.

A digest of the laws of actions and trials at Nisi Prius. By Isaac Espinasse; with the principal cases of American adjudication, by the N. York bar. N. York, Gould, Banks, & Gould.

A critical pronouncing dictionary. By John Walker. Third American from the London stereotype edit. Philadelphia, B. B. Hopkins.

A short Introduction to English Grammar with critical notes. By Robert Lowth. Cambridge, Hilliard and Metcalf.

Dr. Rees' *Cyclopædia* has been published as far as to the 32d number.

* *Dr. Fuller's narrative of the rise, progress, and present state of the Baptist mission in India*, including an account of the number and names of the persons baptized, the translations of the scriptures into the various languages of the East, &c. Second American from the third English edition.

Memoirs respecting an Ecclesiastical Establishment in British India, By Claudius Buchanan. 2d Cambridge edition; with Bogue's Sermon, en-

titled objections against a mission to the heathen, stated and considered. Cambridge, Hilliard and Metcalf.

Rev. Melville Horne's sermon, preached in London June 11, 1811, before the society for missions to Africa and the East, at their eleventh anniversary. Second American edit. Boston, S. T. Armstrong.

Hewes' communicant's companion. Boston, S. T. Armstrong.

Pastoral advice to a young person lately confirmed, by a minister of the church of England. Newburyport, Thomas & Whipple.

Hymns suited to the feasts and fasts of the protestant episcopal church in the United States of America, and other occasions of worship. Newburyport, Thomas & Whipple.

The coquette; or the history of Eliza Wharton: a novel, founded on fact, by a lady of Massachusetts. Newburyport, Thomas & Whipple.

Perkins and Fairman's round hand stereographic copies. Newburyport, Thomas & Whipple.

Classical and sacred music, with a concise system of rudiments; compiled and arranged by Jonathan Huntington, teacher of sacred music and an English grammar school at Roxbury. Boston, Munroe & Francis.

Terms of Christian Communion, with the solution of various questions and cases of conscience arising from this subject. By Isaac Watts, D. D. First American edition. Boston, Samuel T. Armstrong.

The Vision of Don Roderick; a poem. By Walter Scott, Esq. Boston, J. Greenleaf.

Vol. I. of an exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews; with the preliminary Exercitations. By John Owen, D. D. Revised and abridged, with a full and interesting life of the author, a copious index, &c. By Edward Williams. In four volumes. Boston, Samuel T. Armstrong.

Self-control; a novel. Philadelphia, B. B. Hopkins and Co. 2d edition, Boston.

The British Spy; the fourth edition, corrected by the author. Baltimore.

Vols. I. and II. of an Exposition of the New Testament; in which the sense of the Sacred Text is given; doctrinal and practical truths are set in a plain and easy light; difficult passages explained; seeming contradictions reconciled; and whatever is material in the various readings and several Oriental versions is observed. The whole illustrated with notes, taken from the most ancient Jewish writings. By John Gill, D. D. in three vols. Philadelphia, W. W. Woodward.

Lock's Reasonableness of Christianity with a preface by the American Editor. Boston, T. B. Wait and Co.

The Bible with a commentary and critical notes by Adam Clarke, L.L.D. E Sargent, New York. Three first numbers.

Two lectures on comets, by John Winthrop, L.L. D. late professor at Harvard College; and Essays on comets, by Andrew Oliver, Esq. with an appendix of new matter. Boston, T. B. Wait & Co.

Works in Press, or proposed to be published.

Edward Parker and Joseph Delaplaine, booksellers, Philadelphia, propose publishing by subscription, the New Edinburgh Encyclopædia, conducted by David Brewster, LL. D. F. R. S. Ed. with the assistance of upwards of one hundred gentlemen of the first eminence in Europe; in 12 vols. 4to. Improvements will be added by a large number of American gentlemen, whose names are given. Each volume is to contain about 800 or 900 pages. An half volume to be issued every three months: the first in January, 1812; the price \$4 an half volume. Subscriptions received in Boston by Charles Williams or Elam Bliss, No 8, State street. [Not more, we believe, than 2 volumes of the above work can yet have been published in Scotland; nor have we seen any review of it in the latest publications which have been received. We know nothing of Dr Brewster, except that he has edited Ferguson's Mechanics, which he has illustrated with valuable and judicious additions.]

A new Medical Journal, to be continued quarterly, will be issued at Boston 1st Jan. 1812.

William Hilliard has in press, and will publish in a few days, an Introduction to the Geography of the New Testament, for the use of young persons. By Lant Carpenter, LL. D.

W. H. has also in press, shortly to be published, the arithmetical part of the late President Webber's course of Mathematics, intended for the use of academies and schools, as a preparatory study for admission to the University.

William Hilliard proposes to publish the following works:—

Schleusner's Greek Lexicon, in one volume 4to, for an account of which see literary notice, page 213.

Lectures by Herbert Marsh, to be continued yearly, as received from England, and to be printed in the same manner as the English edition of the two first numbers. See literary notice, page 116.

Essays on the nature and principles of taste. By Archibald Alison, LL. B. F. R. S. Reviewed in the 35th number of the Edinburgh Review.

Thomson's system of Mineralogy, with an index and a glossary of Mineralogical terms, from the last Edinburgh edition, in one volume 8vo.

 TO CORRESPONDENTS.

IT is requested that all communications should be furnished as early as six weeks before the time of issuing the number, in which it is intended they should be inserted.

 ERRATA.

Page 17, line 3, for "fourth," read fifth.

43, l. 2 from bottom, for "166," read 116.

114, to Moore's Anacreon annex the signature T.

128, l. 8, for "life of Orpheus," read History of Optics.

224, l. 8, in some copies, for "finished," read published.

THE
GENERAL REPOSITORY

FOR APRIL 1812.

Theological Department.

NEC TEMERE, NEC TIMIDE.

**AN ACCOUNT OF THE CONTROVERSY
BETWEEN DR. PRIESTLEY AND DR. HORSLEY, THE MONTHLY
REVIEWER, AND OTHERS.**

Continued from p. 58.

IN the last number of the Repository, I stated an objection, which opposes itself at the very commencement to Dr. Priestley's hypothesis, and the manner in which this objection may be answered. I now proceed to another part of the controversy; and am about to give a view of the arguments, on the one side and on the other, respecting the belief of the ancient Jewish Christians. The belief of the Jewish Christians is, by Dr. Priestley and his opponents, considered, in respect to a principal branch of the controversy, separately (as the nature of the subject requires) from that of the ancient Gentile Church.

I have already noticed the arguments, by which Dr. Priestley in his History of the Corruptions, endeavours to establish the unitarianism of the Jewish church in the earliest times. I shall now proceed to explain his arguments, as they were more fully brought out in the course of the controversy, and as they were finally stated by him in his History of Early Opinions, together with the objections to them, and the arguments to support a contrary opinion, produced by his opponents. I shall not however always follow the course of the controversy, but sometimes, for the sake of brevity, and more for the sake of perspicuity, merely state the final results, and the arguments as they

were left by the opposite parties. It is not necessary, though it might be amusing, to give a view of the different movements on either side, in which there is often something of perplexity and confusion, if it be known what ground was finally occupied. I shall however recollect to notice those lapses and errors charged upon Dr. Priestley, which in some cases, not affecting the main question, might not appear in the final result. With regard to the notes annexed to the following account, it may prevent the attention of the reader from being unnecessarily interrupted, to mention that they are for the most part not illustrative of the text, but contain incidental and additional matter.

I have already stated Dr. Priestley's assertion of the identity of the Nazarenes and Ebionites. The Ebionites were a sect composed of Jews, and believing the mere humanity of our Saviour. Dr. Priestley maintains, that they were the same with the Nazarenes, and constituted the great body of the Jewish believers. His opponents on the contrary maintain, that the Nazarenes were a different sect, heretical indeed in some other respects, but orthodox in their belief of our Lord's divinity; and that, beside these two sects, there were other Jewish Christians entirely orthodox. Dr. Priestley's arguments in support of his opinion are as follow. Epiphanius, who is the first writer (about A. D. 374), who speaks of the Nazarenes as heretics, describes them as having existed in the times of the apostles themselves. The latest date assigned for their origin, by modern writers who consider them as heretics, is the reign of Adrian, immediately subsequent to his edict for banishing all Jews from Jerusalem, or as it was then called, *Ælia Capitolina*, (about A. D. 135). They must therefore have existed in the time of Irenæus, who was chosen Bishop of Lyons about A. D. 179, and wrote his work against heresies not long after. But the name of Nazarenes is not mentioned by him in his work expressly written upon heresies, nor does he speak of any other Jewish Christians except Ebionites. By this latter name therefore, we may infer were then designated those, who were afterwards denominated Nazarenes. The same inference may be drawn from the silence of Tertullian (about A. D. 200) respecting any heretics called Nazarenes,

though he speaks of the Ebionites. But a far more important witness is Origen (about A. D. 230), who says generally, without making any exceptions, that the Jews believing Jesus to be Christ were called Ebionites, and describes all Jewish Christians as rejecting the doctrine of Christ's divinity. As there is no question of the Nazarenes having existed in his time in considerable numbers, this testimony, if not disputed, is decisive of the fact of their being the same with the Ebionites. But though here alleged merely for that purpose, it is of still more importance as a direct proof of the unitarianism of the whole Jewish church in his time. Origen mentions two sorts of Ebionites, one of whom believed the miraculous conception, and the other disbelieved it. Eusebius (about A. D. 325) likewise mentions these two sorts of Ebionites, who both, according to him likewise, rejected the doctrine of Christ's divinity, but makes no mention of any Nazarenes as differing from them.* The silence of Eusebius concerning the Nazarenes, supposing them to have been different from the Ebionites, is particularly difficult to account for, as in that case it would have been his business to have noticed them as an ecclesiastical historian. Epiphanius in his work on heresies speaks both of Nazarenes and Ebionites, but Dr. Priestley contends, that he describes them as having no essential differences of opinion, and agreeing in the belief of our Lord's mere humanity; and he produces a passage from his chapter against the Arians, in which St. John is said to have written his gospel to correct the error of those, such as the Ebionites, the Cerinthians and Merinthians, and the Nazarenes, who believed that Christ was a mere man (*ὁ μόνος ἀνθρώπος*). Jerom (about A. D. 400) is the next witness. There is a passage produced from a letter of his to Austin, from which Dr. Priestley infers, that though he was acquainted with the nominal distinction between the Ebionites and Nazarenes, he did not consider them as really or at least materially differing from each other. Austin, his contemporary, says that the Nazarenes were by some called

* The passage in which Eusebius speaks of the Ebionites, which will not hereafter be quoted in the text, is in his *Hist. Lib. iii. c. 27*. I should have quoted the passage, but for its length, and that there is no dispute as to its meaning, as far as I have given it.

Symmachians after Symmachus, one of the translators of the Hebrew scriptures into Greek. But Symmachus was an Ebionite, and wrote expressly against the miraculous conception. It is therefore to be concluded, that the Nazarenes were Ebionites. Finally, Theodoret (about A. D. 450), who living in Syria had a good opportunity of being acquainted with the Nazarenes, says, "the Nazarenes are Jews, who honor Christ as a "righteous man; and use the gospel according to Peter."* From the first part of this description, it appears that those, whom he called Nazarenes, had the distinguishing characteristic of the Ebionites, not acknowledging the divinity of Christ. From all these authorities Dr. Priestley concludes, that 'the Ebionites' and 'the Nazarenes' were only two different names for the same people. This opinion, he says, "is maintained by Le Clerc, and the most eminent critics of the last age"† "The

* Hæc. Fol. lib. ii. cap. 2. Opera, vol. iv. p. 219.

† Hist. of Ear. Opp. B. 3. c. 8. In the second of his First Letters to Dr. Horsley, Dr. Priestley said—"It is rather extraordinary, that such a point should now be made of finding some difference of importance between the "Nazarenes and the Ebionites, when no critic, I believe, of any name in the "last age pretended to find any." Dr. Horsley in reply, after remarking that Mosheim has made a difference between them, adds—"It may be Mosheim "was the inventor of this distinction, since you have not found it in any critic of "any name of the last age. Perhaps, Sir, you and I, when we speak of critics "of any name, may not always agree in the persons, to whom we would apply "that description. May I then take leave to ask, what you think of Hugo "Grotius? Was he a critic of any name? Vossius, Spencer, Huetius, were "these critics of any name? If they were, Sir, you must come again to your "confessions." For Hugo Grotius, Vossius, Spencer, and Huetius† agree that "the Nazarenes and Ebionites, though sometimes confounded, were distinct "sects; and they maintain the opinion, which I now maintain, of the high or- "thodoxy of the proper Nazarenes in the article of our Lord's divinity."

This is not correct. Spencer, (whose note may be found vol. i. p. 385 of De-larue's edition of Origen,) makes the difference between the Nazarenes and those most properly called Ebionites to consist in this, that the former believed the miraculous conception, and the latter did not. It is the same difference, which Origen and Eusebius make between the two kinds of Ebionites, and under the

* Referring to Dr. Priestley's acknowledging the errors pointed out in his History of the Corruptions.

† "Grotius in Matth. c. I. Vossius de genere Jesu Christi cap. ii. § 1. Spencer in Origen contra Celsam, ad p. 56. Huetius in Origenis commentaria, p. 74."

“learned Jeremiah Jones, after disposing in opposite columns
“all that he could collect concerning them both, from the best

name of Ebionites, as one of the kinds, into which these writers have divided them, Spencer thinks were included the Nazarenes. He does not maintain the opinion of the high orthodoxy of the proper Nazarenes. On the contrary, he quotes the passage of Eusebius, in which the two kinds of Ebionites are spoken of, and in which it is denied of either, that they believed the divinity of Christ, and supposes, as I have mentioned, that the Nazarenes were the same with that class of Ebionites spoken of in this passage, who are said to have believed the miraculous conception. Vossius says, that the Nazarenes and Ebionites are improperly confounded by most writers; but he seems to make no greater distinction between them, than is made by Spencer. Referring to Grotius he says, “bene distinguit [i. e. Grotius] Nazaræos et Ebionitas, qui perperam confundi solent: quippe Nazaræi proprie ita dicti agnoscebant Jesum e Sp. S. conceptum, eumque Dei esse filium fatebantur, ut Augustinus de iis scribit. . . . Ebionæi autem non agnoscebant ejusmodi conceptionem; sed credebant Jesum aliorum instar hominum a Josepho conceptum.” He likewise supposes the Nazarenes to have been the same with that class of the Ebionites, who believed the miraculous conception, as the latter are divided by Origen in his fifth book against Celsus: Origen there using, according to Vossius, the name of Ebionites in its most extensive sense. This likewise was the opinion of Grotius. What Grotius thought the belief of the Nazarenes to have been respecting the preexistence and divinity of Christ, it may not be easy to conclude from what he has written, if we consider, in connexion with it, his own theological opinions. He could not have supposed that the Nazarenes were orthodox in their belief, and at the same time have supposed them one class of the Ebionites, if he had attended to the passage of Eusebius just mentioned, or to a passage of Origen (in his Comment. in Mattheum, tom. xvi.) hereafter to be quoted, in which he divides the Jewish Christians into the two classes of Ebionites, and says of them both, as is said by Eusebius, that they had no belief of the divinity of Christ. The note of Huetius, referred to by Horsley, is on this latter passage of Origen, and may be seen tom. iii. p. 733 of Delarue's edition of Origen. Huetius does “maintain the “high orthodoxy of the proper Nazarenes;” but is far from thinking that this is done by Grotius or Vossius, to whom he objects for their supposing the Nazarenes the same with either class of the Ebionites. The opinion of Grotius and Vossius is likewise viewed in the same manner by Michael Lequien, the editor of Joannes Damascenus, in his seventh dissertation prefixed to that author, to which I am referred by Mosheim in his Comment. de Stat. Christ. ante Constant. Sæc. ii. § 39. not. * * * In this dissertation he maintains the orthodoxy of the Nazarenes on the subject of Christ's divinity. After mentioning that the heresy of the Ebionites principally consisted in believing Christ a mere man, he says—“The Socinians therefore, and antitrinitarians of our time, regard them as their patriarchs, and do not hesitate to unite the Nazarenes with them. In this they are favoured by Hugo Grotius, and Johannes G. Vossius, and by other protestants, who are not sufficiently opposed by the writers of the catholic

"authorities, concludes with saying, 'It is plain there was a very great agreement between these two ancient sects; and though they went under different names, yet they seem only to differ in this, that the Ebionites had made some addition to the old Nazarene system. For Origen tells us they were called Ebionites, who from among the Jews owned Jesus to be the Christ.*' The running title of this chapter is, *The Nazarenes and Ebionites the same.*"†

church, if we except one only, the very illustrious and truly learned bishop of Avranches, Daniel Huet." "Quamobrem nostra ætate Sociniani et Antitrinitarii illos [Ebionitas] tanquam Patriarchas suas habent, quibus Nazarenos adjungere non dubitarunt. Ipsis porro hac in parte fauerunt Hugo Grotius, Johannes G. Vossius, alique protestantium, non satis reluctantibus catholicis scriptoribus, si unum exceperis, illustrissimum vereque doctissimum præsulem Abricensium, Dancielem Huetium."

With regard to Mosheim, whom Dr. Horsley quotes in his favor, he was very far from thinking, that the orthodoxy of the Nazarenes on the subject of Christ's divinity could be established, as may be seen in his *De Reb. Christ. ante Constant. Comment. Sæc. ii. § 39. cum notis*. The section is referred to, and quoted by Dr. Horsley, but not so as to give a full knowledge of Mosheim's opinion.

* "Jones on the Canon, vol. i. p. 386."

† First Letters to Dr. Horsley, Let. 2. As I shall not again notice this passage, I will here mention a remark concerning it of the Monthly Reviewer. In his Second Letters to Dr. Horsley, Dr. Priestley again mentions the authority of Jones. In a note to the review of these Letters [Month. Rev. vol. lxxii. p. 123.] The Monthly Reviewer says, "It deserves however to be noticed, that this Mr. Jeremiah Jones, in a tract written against Whiston, intitled a *Vindication of the former part of St. Matthew's Gospel*, and published but a few years before his death, asserts expressly, that 'the NAZARENES and EBIONITES were certainly two different sects, and not the same persons, as Mr. Toland, according to his OLD WAY OF BLUNDERING, would have them to be.'" It will probably appear to most readers from this note, that Mr. Jones changed his opinion toward the close of his life, and adopted one opposite to that quoted from him by Dr. Priestley. The fact is, that he did change his opinion, but in a manner directly contrary. His 'Vindication,' quoted above by the Reviewer, was published in 1721. His 'Method of settling the Canon,' quoted by Dr. Priestley, was left incomplete by him at his death, and published in 1726. In this work, having occasion to examine more critically the subject of the Nazarenes and Ebionites, he has adopted an opinion opposite to that he had before given. His having previously asserted a different opinion, only serves to render his authority of more importance, in favor of that which he adopted upon inquiry.

With regard to no heretics being mentioned of the name of Nazarenes by any writer before Epiphanius, Dr. Priestley observes—"It is an argument in favour of the identity of the Nazarenes and Ebionites, that the former are not mentioned by name by any writer who likewise speaks of the Ebionites, before Epiphanius, who was fond of multiplying heresies, though the people so called were certainly known before his time. The term Ebionites only occurs in Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, and Eusebius. None of them make any mention of Nazarenes; and yet it cannot be denied, that they must have been even more considerable in the time of those writers, than they were afterwards.

"The conduct of all these writers is easily accounted for on the suppositions, that in the time of Justin Martyr, the Jewish Christians, though all unitarians, and even disbelieving the miraculous conception, were not known by any opprobrious appellation at all; that afterwards they were first distinguished by that of Ebionites; and that it was not till the time of Epiphanius (when such writers as he, who wrote expressly on the subject of *heresy*, made a parade of their learning, by recounting a multiplicity of heresies) that the term Nazarenes, by which the unbelieving Jews still continued to call the Christians among them, was laid hold of, as signifying a sect different from that of the Ebionites.*

Such are the arguments of Dr. Priestley to prove the Nazarenes the same people with the Ebionites. We shall now proceed to state in what manner they have been answered.

With regard to the Nazarenes not being mentioned as heretics by any writer before Epiphanius, that is not by Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, nor Eusebius, who all speak of the Ebionites, and the improbability of this being the case, if the former had been a separate sect from the latter, and most considerable, (as they must have been,) in their number in the time of these writers; with regard to this statement, which I have quoted from the History of Early Opinions, and which is to be found, in a little different form, in the third of Dr. Priestley's Second Letters to Dr. Horsley, no reply was made by Dr. Horsley, neither

* Hist. of Early Opinions B. 3. c. 8.

in his Remarks upon these letters, nor in his additional notes to the collection of his tracts in this controversy; nor is any reply suggested by the Monthly Reviewer. With regard to Eusebius alone, Jamieson remarks; "Though we should grant that Eusebius, in no part of his writings, referred to believing Hebrews who adhered to the law, and continued in the doctrine of our Saviour's divinity, it would only amount to a negative proof."*

Particular remarks and criticisms are made by Dr. Horsley, and the monthly reviewer, on the passages produced by Dr. Priestley from Origen, Epiphanius, and Jerom. What is said in respect

* Vindication, B. 5. c. 5. s. 1. Jamieson, in the same section, likewise comments upon Dr. Priestley's remark, that "Irenæus gives no other name to any Jewish Christians besides that of Ebionites." "And what," says Jamieson, "if he does not? It was his avowed design and proper work to enumerate the heretical sects, and not the particular bodies of men that adhered to sound doctrine. Is it not enough that he asserts, in the strongest language, that 'all the churches of Asia,' the 'most ancient churches,' held the same Apostolical tradition, which himself held? But the truth is, Irenæus does not even say that the Ebionites were Jewish Christians, or that they were of Jewish origin. Shall we therefore conclude, that in his time there were no Jewish Christians at all? This would be just as good an inference from Irenæus, as that of there being no Jewish Christians besides Ebionites." It is true; Irenæus does not say, that the Ebionites were Jewish Christians, or that they were of Jewish origin. What is said by Irenæus of the Ebionites admits however of as little doubt that they were of Jewish origin, as if he had asserted it in direct words. He says, "*circumciduntur ac perseverant in his consuetudinibus quæ sunt secundum legem, et Judaico charactere vitæ uti, et Hierosolymam adorant, quasi domus sit Dei.*" [Lib. i. c. 26.] I notice on the page of Jamieson opposite to that from which I have quoted, an assertion of a similar character to the one just noticed. I will give the passage, though it is not immediately connected with the present subject. "From Irenæus we learn, that the ancient heretics were far more honest than their successors. Socinians still appeal to the Apostles, as if they had been all Ebionites. But the ancient heretics, conscious that they could make no such appeal, as they paid more regard to the meaning of language, observed a different method." He then produces a passage from Irenæus to confirm his statement. The obvious inference from what he thus writes, is, that the ancient unitarians did not appeal to the authority of the apostles, and the scriptures. The indisputable fact, which Jamieson might not have ventured expressly to deny, is that they did make this appeal. The heretics, of whom Irenæus is speaking in the passage partially quoted by Jamieson, were Gnostics.

to Origen, constitutes a very important branch of the controversy, and of this therefore I shall, for the present, defer the statement, till after noticing the remarks concerning Epiphanius and Jerom, and what is brought forward concerning the Nazarenes by Dr. Priestley's opponents. I proceed to quote what Dr. Priestley produces from the chapter on the Ebionites in Epiphanius' work on Heresies. It was first alleged at length by him in the second of his First Letters to Dr. Horsley, and is repeated in his History of Early Opinions, B. 3. c. 8.

" Epiphanius says, in the middle of his first section relating to the Ebionites, that Ebion (whom in the twenty-fourth section he makes to be cotemporary with the apostle John) " borrowed his abominable rites from the Samaritans, his opinion (*γνώμη*) from the Nazarenes, his name from the Jews, &c.' And he says, in the beginning of the second section, " he was cotemporary with the former, and had the same origin with them; and first he asserted that Christ was born of the commerce and seed of man, namely, Joseph, as we signified above,' referring to the first words of his first section, ' when we said that in other respects he agreed with them all, and differed from them only in this, viz. in his adherence to the laws of the Jews with respect to the sabbath, circumcision, and other things that were enjoined by the Jews and Samaritans. He moreover adopted many more things than the Jews, in imitation of the Samaritans,' the particulars of which he then proceeds to mention.

" In the same section he speaks of the Ebionites as inhabiting the same country with the Nazarenes, and adds, that " agreeing together, they communicated of their perverseness to each other.' Then, in the third section, he observes, that " afterwards some of the Ebionites entertained a different opinion concerning Christ, than that he was the son of Joseph; supposing that after Elxæus joined them, they learned of him some fancy concerning Christ, and the Holy Spirit.

" Concerning the Nazarenes, in the seventh section of his account of them, he says, that they were Jews in all respects, except that they 'believed in Christ; but I do not know whether they hold the miraculous conception or not.' This

“amounts to no more than a doubt, which he afterward abandoned, by asserting that the Ebionites held the same opinion concerning Christ with the Nazarenes, which opinion he expressly states to be their belief, that Jesus was a mere man, and the son of Joseph.”

Such is the evidence from Epiphanius, which Dr. Priestley produced in his *First Letters to Dr. Horsley*. I originally intended to insert in the text an account of Dr. Horsley's criticisms, in reply to this evidence, which occupy thirteen pages of his sixth letter; but I have thought it preferable to give this account as a note. If inserted in the text, it must have occupied a place disproportioned to the importance of the criticisms; and I was doubtful likewise of my being able to make it intelligible to readers unacquainted with the original language of Epiphanius, without more attention than many might be willing to bestow. What relates to the passages of Epiphanius above quoted, is, as it originally stood, one of the most perplexed and obscure parts of the controversy. I have endeavoured to give it below in such a manner as to render it perspicuous.*

* “Now Sir,” says Dr. Horsley in reply to what I have quoted from Dr. Priestley, “in these quotations, I have to complain partly of the want of critical discernment, partly of stratagem, partly of unskilful interpretation; and I affirm, that not one of the passages alleged is to your purpose.” Dr. Horsley first objects to Dr. Priestley's making Epiphanius say, that Ebion took his opinion from the Nazarenes: “here Sir,” says Dr. Horsley, “is stratagem,”—“Epiphanius says that Ebion took his opinion from the Ossæans, the Nazoræans and the Nasaræans.” The Nazoræans of Epiphanius were the Christian Nazarenes, but the Nasaræans, and the Ossæans were Jewish sects. “So that if any thing,” says Dr. Horsley, “is asserted in this clause concerning the opinions of Ebion, it is that they were a mixture of three sects, two Jewish, and one Christian.” Dr. Priestley did not reply particularly to any part of Dr. Horsley's criticisms on the evidence of Epiphanius. It may be said in answer to the preceding remark, that the word, which Dr. Priestley renders opinion (*γνῶμη*) having the article prefixed to it, (*ἡ γνῶμη*—*Ὁσσηναι δὲ, καὶ Ναζωραῖων, καὶ Νασαρητῶν γνῶμη*), is made to signify something supposed to be already known, and belonging wholly to each of the three sects considered separately, and not any thing belonging partly to one, and partly to another of them. Allowing *γνῶμη* to mean ‘opinion,’ the words of Epiphanius, it may be asserted are equivalent to the English words—“he had the opinion of the Ossæans, the Nazoræans and the Nasaræans.” But in this passage there can be no dispute, that the opinion spoken of must be an opinion belong-

If the criticisms of Dr. Horsley were valid, they would wrest from Dr. Priestley a part of the evidence, to be do-

ing to each sect considered by itself, and that there would, from this passage, be no more impropriety in saying, that Ebion, or whoever was spoken of, held the opinion of the Nazarenes, than if the Nazarenes alone had been mentioned in it.

Dr. Horsley next objects to *γνώμη* being rendered 'opinion,' though he confesses it often has that meaning. He would render it 'sentiment;' and say that Ebion agreed with the sects beforementioned, in that illiberality of sentiment, which inclined them to superstitious observances. Jamieson likewise wants to substitute a different meaning, and renders it 'plan,' which he explains 'plan of adhering to the Mosaic law.' The argument of both is, that if *γνώμη* be understood to mean opinion, it is used afterward as an unnecessary synonym. It may be doubted whether Epiphanius is a sufficiently accurate writer to give much force to this remark; especially as, if it were correct, he would, in telling of Ebion's collecting what was abominable in him from every sect, not tell from what sect he had his opinions. Epiphanius says, "Σαμαρείται μὲν γὰρ ἔχουσιν τὸ βδελύεσθαι, Ἰουδαῖοι δὲ τὸ σινοῦν, Ὀρθόδοξοι δὲ καὶ Ναζωραῖοι καὶ Νασσαραῖοι τὴν γνώμην, Καρθεῖαι δὲ τὸ υἱοῦν, Καρθεῖαι καὶ τὴν κακοτροπίαν, καὶ Χριστιανοὶ βουλομένης ἔχουσιν τὴν προσηγορίαν."

Dr. Horsley next gives it as his belief, that the second section of Epiphanius' account of the Ebionites, quoted above by Dr. Priestley, and beginning according to the translation there given—"For he was contemporary with the former and had the same origin with them,"—is corrupt, "too corrupt to be perfectly restored without MSS." Something however he thinks may be done by correct punctuation, and accordingly he gives the passage thus pointed and translated.

"Οὗτος γὰρ ὁ Ἐβίων συγχρόνους μὲν τούτοις ὑπάρχειν, ἀπ' αὐτοῦ δὲ οὐκ αὐτοῦ ὁματός· τὰ πρῶτα δὲ ἐκ πατριάρχου καὶ σκευμαῖος ἀνδρός, τούτου τοῦ Ἰουδαίου, τοῦ Χριστοῦ γεννηθέντος εἰπὼν· ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς προσηγορεύομεν· ὅτι τὰ ἴσα τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐν ἡμέρᾳ φέρονται, ἐν τούτῳ μόνῳ διαφέρει· ὅτι τὴν νόμον τοῦ Ἰουδαίου προσηγορεύει, κατὰ ἐκδόσεσιν, καὶ κατὰ τὴν περιτομήν, καὶ κατὰ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα ὅσα καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ Σαμαρεῖται ἐπιποιεῖσιν· ὅτι δὲ πᾶσι οὗτοι, παρὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, ὁμοίως τοῖς Σαμαρεῖταις δια-
κεῖται."

"For this Ebion was contemporary with these, and he sets out from the same principles with them (but first of all he asserted, that Christ was begotten of the commerce and seed of a man, namely Joseph) as hath been already related by us. For agreeing with other [heretics] in all things [else] he differed in this single point, in that he adhered to the Judaic law with respect to the observation of the sabbaths, and to circumcision, and to all other things which are common to the rites of

rived from the passages of Epiphanius above quoted. It may be worth mentioning however that Huetius (Huet, Bishop

"the Jews and the Samaritana. And besides, he is punctual in many things, not regarded by the Jews, in conformity with the Samaritana."

This second section begins according to Dr. Priestley's translation—"he [i. e. Ebion] was contemporary with the former [i. e. the Nazarenes described in the chapter immediately preceding that on the Ebionites,] and had the same origin with them." This Dr. Horsley, as we have just seen, renders—"Ebion was contemporary with these, and he sets out from the same principles with them;" and thinks it doubtful, whether the Nazarenes are the sect intended as Ebion's contemporaries. He thinks the reference may be to the Jews and Samaritans, who are the persons last mentioned in the preceding section. Or if the reference be not to these, he thinks it may be to all the sects of heretics before mentioned in the first section, from whom Ebion is said to have borrowed. In defence of Dr. Priestley's mode of understanding the reference, it may be said, that Epiphanius begins the first section of his account of the Ebionites, which immediately follows that of the Nazarenes, with saying—"Ebion, from whom are the Ebionites, following next in order, and thinking in the same manner with these [the Nazarenes]... being from their school, but proclaiming and teaching others things beside what they do. [Εβίων, ἀφ' ὧν Εβιονίται, καθ' ἑξ ἀκολουθεῖ, καὶ τὰ ἴδια τούτοις φέρωντας . . . ἐκ τῆς τούτων μὲν σχολῆς ὑπαρχον, ὅτι καὶ παρὰ τούτοις κερύττει, καὶ ὑφ' αὐτοῦ.] Thus Epiphanius writes in the beginning of the first section; and in the beginning of the second, he appears to resume the same reference to the Nazarenes, and the same manner of expression, as may be seen in Dr. Horsley's translation above given. [Οὗτος γὰρ ὁ Εβίων συγχρονὸς μὲν τούτοις ὑπαρχόν, ἀπ' αὐτῶν δὲ οὐν αὐτοῖς ἰσμεται.] Petavius translates this, *Siquidem Ebion iste priorum illorum equalis fuit, et eandem cum ipsis originem accepit.*

Dr. Horsley, (as appears in his translation,) makes a parenthesis of the clause, in which it is said, that Ebion believed Christ to be the son of Joseph, so as to exclude this from being one of those principles borrowed by him from the Nazarenes, supposing them to be the persons spoken of in the beginning of this section. Whether the parenthesis be a natural one, may be judged from his translation. By *τοῖς ἄλλοις* he supposes to be intended all the heretics mentioned in the first section, from whom Ebion borrowed, from all of whom he differed only in a single point; that is, there was nothing in his system, which could not be found in some one of theirs, except "that his Judaism was of the Samaritan cast."

If the Jews and Samaritans be intended in the beginning of the second section, then the purport of the parenthesis, according to Dr. Horsley, is, to remark, that Ebion, even in that part of his doctrine which could not be borrowed either from Jews or Samaritans, carried his desire of accommodating to Jewish principles such a length, as to acknowledge our Lord for nothing more than a preacher of righteousness."

of Avranches) in one of his notes on Origen, refers to the very account of Epiphanius in question, and understands it in a sim-

If by *synon* he meant all the sects of heretics before mentioned, then, says Dr. Horsley, "the importance of the parenthesis must be to signify, "that the meer humanity of Christ was made a principle by Ebion, although "it was no principle with those from whom he borrowed. It was indeed a "part of the Cerinthian doctrine, not as a principle, but as a consequence "from principles."

But to proceed. Epiphanius, says Dr. Priestley, "speaks of the Ebionites inhabiting the same country as the Nazarenes, and adds, 'that "agreeing together, they communicated of their perverseness to each other.'" Dr. Horsley thinks that by Nazarenes, may here be meant not Christian Nazarenes, but Nasarzan Jews, a sect of whom Epiphanius gives an account. "This sect," says Dr. Horsley, "was found chiefly in the "region of Basanitis: and in a town called Cochaba in the same region, "Epiphanius places the original residence of Ebion." Jamieson notices [B. 5. c. 5. s. 1.] without adopting this conjecture; for, as he mentions, "the "existence of this sect is very doubtful." It may be added, that Epiphanius, in the seventh section of his account of the Christian Nazarenes, says of them, that they flourished "principally in a city of the Berzans in Coelo "Syria, and in Decapolis near Pella, and in Basanitis, in a town commonly "called Cocabe, but by the Hebrews Chochabe." Dr. Horsley gives a new translation of the passage quoted by Dr. Priestley, and what the latter had rendered "agreeing together," he translates "being contiguous, he to "them, and they to him," and adds, "What you took for agreement is "contiguity of situation." The original is *Συναφῆς γὰρ οἷς τὸν αὐτὸν τόπον κατοικοῦντες*. The mode of expression almost excludes the idea of mere contiguity of situation, which would not be expressed so emphatically. The meaning of *συναφῆς*, if standing alone, would be equivocal, and might be rendered either as it is by Dr. Priestley, or by Dr. Horsley. Petavius understands the phrase in the same manner with Dr. Priestley, and translates — "Ambo enim, collatis inter se capitibus, suam alter cum altero improbi- "tatem, et nequitiam communicavit."

Dr. Horsley next comments upon Dr. Priestley's assertion, that Epiphanius expresses a doubt whether the Nazarenes believed in the miraculous conception, and afterward abandons this doubt, and gives us to understand, that they did not. Dr. Horsley thinks that the passage of Epiphanius referred to, (which I shall notice in the text,) amounts to the expression of a doubt, whether the Nazarenes did not believe our Lord's divinity, and refers to his Charge, where he argues, that if Epiphanius confessed that he had no ground to assert that they did not believe this article of faith, there is no question that they did believe it; for that it was the temper of Epiphanius, and the temper of the age, to affirm positively all evil of heretics, which there was any ground, or pretence for affirming. I may here add that Jamieson [B. 5. c. 5. s. 1.] likewise thinks "that Epiphanius

ilar manner to Dr. Priestley; that is, as contradicting the notion of the orthodoxy of the Nazarenes; which he himself is maintaining in the same note. The objection, which Huetius makes to the argument to be drawn from Epiphanius against his opinion, is that that writer does not seem to have had any certain accounts of the opinions of the Nazarenes, which Huetius infers from the ignorance, which he expresses respecting their belief concerning the miraculous conception. What Huetius says, is as follows. "For although Epiphanius writes that the Nazarenes were in error respecting Christ, and maintained the same opinion as the Cerinthians, and that the Ebionites borrowed their dogmas from the Ossæans, and Nazarenes, and that both kinds of heretics having their origin from the same place, Cocabe, a town of Basanitis, agreed together; yet he has stated every thing relating to the heresy of the Nazarenes without certain information and doubtingly."*

But the importance of the criticisms of Dr. Horsley is very much diminished by the production of other passages from Epiphanius, whose meaning does not admit dispute. In his Second Letters, Dr. Priestley does not enter into a particular reply to the criticisms of which we speak, but he says—"I cannot raise Epiphanius himself from the dead, to solve the question concerning *his opinion*, [respecting the Nazarenes,] nor do I wish to disturb the good Father's repose; but, though dead, he speaks sufficiently plain for my purpose in the following passage.

"*abandoned his doubt* in a manner directly the reverse of what Dr. Priestley represents as the fact;" for that Epiphanius, in the synopsis or index prefixed to the second tome, or division of his work, in referring to the Nazarenes, says of them, that they believe Jesus to be the Son of God, which according to Jamieson amounts to a confession of his divinity. We shall have occasion to notice this passage hereafter.

* *Quamvis enim male de Christo sensisse Nazaræos, eandemque propugnasse sententiam ac Cerinthianos, scribit Epiphanius hæc. 29. cap. 1. et ab Ossæis et Nazaræis sua dogmata expressisse Ebionites; et ex eodem loco, Basanatidis nempe pago, Cocabe, hæreticos utrosque exortos capita simul contulisse doceat hæc. 29. cap. 7. et hæc. 30. cap. 3. quidquid tamen de Nazaræorum hæresi prodidit, id parum certus, et dubitando proposuit. [Ad Comment. in Mattheum. Tom. xvi. Orig. Op. Tom. iii. p. 733. Edit. Delarue.]*

“ ‘ Wherefore the blessed John coming, and finding men
 “ employed about the humanity of Christ, and the Ebionites
 “ being in an error about the earthly genealogy of Christ de-
 “ duced from Abraham, carried by Luke as high as Adam,
 “ and finding the Cerinthians and Merinthians maintaining that
 “ he was a mere man, born by natural generation of both the
 “ sexes, and also the Nazarenes, and many other heresies; as
 “ coming last (for he was the fourth to write a gospel) began
 “ as it were to call back the wanderers, and those who were
 “ employed about the humanity of Christ; and seeing some of
 “ them going into rough paths, leaving the strait and true path,
 “ cries, ‘ Whither are you going, whither are you walking, who
 “ tread a rough and dangerous path, leading to a precipice? It
 “ is not so. The God, the logos, which was begotten by the
 “ Father from all eternity, is not from Mary only. He is not
 “ from the time of Joseph, he is not from the time of Salathiel,
 “ and Zerobabel, and David, and Abraham, and Jacob, and
 “ Noah, and Adam; but in the beginning was the logos, and
 “ the logos was with God, and the logos was God. The *was*,
 “ and the *was*, and the *was*, do not admit of his having ever
 “ not been.’ ”

“ After reading this passage,” continues Dr. Priestley,
 “ can any person entertain a doubt but that, in the opinion of
 “ Epiphanius at least, (and weak as he was in some things, he
 “ stands uncontradicted *in this* by any authority whatever, and
 “ his account is confirmed by the most respectable ones in all
 “ antiquity,) the Nazarenes were not only a sect of Jewish
 “ Christians in the time of the apostles, but, together with the
 “ Ebionites, a very formidable sect, and that this sect held the
 “ doctrine of the simple humanity of Christ? Did he not, as
 “ appears by this passage, consider the Nazarenes as standing
 “ in need of being taught the pre-existence and divinity of
 “ Christ, as well as the Ebionites, and the other sects that he
 “ here mentions or alludes to?

“ In another place this writer compares the Nazarenes to
 “ persons who, seeing a fire at a distance, and not understand-
 “ ing the cause, or use of it, run towards it and burn them-
 “ selves; so ‘ these Jews, he says, on hearing the name of Jesus

"only, and the miracles performed by the apostles, believe on him; and knowing that he was born at Nazareth, and brought up in the house of Joseph, and that on that account he was called a *Nazarene*, (the apostles styling him *a man of Nazareth, approved by miracles and mighty deeds*,) imposed that name upon themselves." How, Sir, does this agree with this writer's supposing that the Nazarenes, of whom he was treating, were well instructed in the doctrine of the divinity of Christ? Also, how does this agree with the late origin that "you give to these Nazarenes?"*

With regard to the first of these extracts, (which is the one before referred to, page 231, from Epiphanius' chapter against the Arians) Dr. Horsley replies in one of his additional notes, that the passage "clearly proves that the Ebionites and the Nazarenes in the judgment of that writer [Epiphanius] were different sects, inasmuch as both are separately mentioned." He adds however—"It must be acknowledged, that in this passage, the Nazarenes are mentioned together with the Ebionites, as sects in error in their opinions about Christ, and confuted by the beginning of St. John's Gospel; still I maintain, that, in that part of his work where he professedly treats of the heresy of the Nazarenes, Epiphanius expresses a doubt of their heterodoxy upon the article of our Lord's divinity, in such terms as ought to leave no doubt upon the mind of his reader of their orthodoxy in that particular."†

The passage from that part of the work of Epiphanius which treats of the heresy of the Nazarenes here referred to, is that, (just now mentioned in the quotation from Huetius) in which, according to Dr. Priestley, Epiphanius expresses his ignorance, whether the Nazarenes believed the miraculous conception or not; and which Dr. Horsley thus renders: "But concerning Christ," says Epiphanius, "I cannot say whether they think him a mere man; (*ἥλθεν ἀνθρώπου*;) or affirm, as the truth is, that he was begotten of Mary by the Holy Ghost." [*καὶ οὐκ ἀληθινὸν ἔχει, διὰ σπουδαίας ἡγούμενης ἐν Μαρίας διαδοχαισιν*]. "To affirm, as the truth is," says Dr. Horsley,‡ "that he was begotten of Mary by

* Second Letters to Dr. Horsley, Let. 3.

† Letters to Dr. Priestley, Letter 6, Additional note.

‡ Charge I. Sect. 11.

"the Holy Ghost, in Epiphanius' sense of those words, was a full confession of his divinity." For this assertion Dr. Horsley gives no evidence, and it is not one, whose intrinsic probability may recommend it without evidence. The Greek words have no more force than is contained in the English words.—'To affirm, as is true, that he was begotten' &c. Epiphanius merely expresses *his* belief of the truth of the miraculous conception, and his doubt whether the Nazarenes acknowledged it. But it can hardly be pretended, that a belief of the miraculous conception may not coexist with a disbelief of the deity of Christ.

With regard to Dr. Priestley's remark, that Epiphanius stands uncontradicted by any authority whatever, in asserting that the Nazarenes held the doctrine of the simple humanity of Christ, Dr. Horsley says—"Dr. Priestley is mistaken; rashly venturing to assert, that where no authority is known to him, none is extant. Epiphanius is in this contradicted, not only by himself, as I have already shewn, but by a writer of far superior credit; by Joannes Damascenus, who, in his book *De Haresibus*, says expressly, that the Nazarenes confessed Jesus to be the Son of God. Damascenus would not have said of Dr. Priestley, or of any one maintaining the simple humanity of Christ, that he confesses Jesus to be the Son of God."*

It may be doubted whether Joannes Damascenus, a writer of the eighth century, the last of the Greek Fathers, is any authority on this subject; and if he be, it is still doubtful, whether his asserting, that the Nazarenes confessed Jesus to be the Son of God, amounts to an assertion, that they confessed him to be God.

I have quoted the remarks of Dr. Horsley upon that passage of Epiphanius, which alone he has noticed, of the two that Dr. Priestley produces in his Second Letters. It is quoted again by Dr. Priestley in his History of Early opinions (B. 3. chap. 7.) I do not find however that it is noticed by Jamieson.

Jamieson after remarking on what Dr. Priestley has quoted from Epiphanius' account of the Ebionites, says that Dr. Priestley

* Letters to Dr. Priestley, Letter 6. Additional note.

"can infer as little from it, as from another passage with respect to the Nazarenes, [referred to by Huetius in the note "which I have quoted from him,] in which Epiphanius asserts "their agreement with the Cerinthians. 'They held,' says "Epiphanius, 'the same opinions.'"* Of the Cerinthians and Ebionites, "it might justly be said," says Dr. Horsley in his charge, (1. § 16.), "that they asserted the mere humanity of "the Redeemer." Why Dr. Priestley therefore, if he had produced this passage, could have drawn no inference from it, as Jamieson does, not proceed to show, it might be fruitless to inquire.

I now come to the testimony of Jerom, produced by Dr. Priestley. It was alluded to by him in his first Reply to the Monthly Reviewer, Sect. 1. It is given at length in his Remarks on the Monthly Review annexed to his first Letters to Dr. Horsley, and is repeated in the History of Early Opinions, B. 3. c. 8. The following is the passage according to Dr. Priestley. It is from a letter of Jerom to Austin, in which he is arguing against the opinion of Austin, that the ritual law of Moses might be lawfully observed by Jewish Christians. "If "this be true," he says, "we fall into the heresy of Cherintus "and Ebion, who, believing in Christ, were anathematized by "the Fathers on this account only, that they mixed the ceremonies of the law with the gospel of Christ, and held to the "new" (dispensation) "in such a manner as not to lose the "old. What shall I say concerning the Ebionites, who pretend that they are Christians? It is to this very day in all "the synagogues of the east, a heresy among the Jews, called "that of the *Minei*, now condemned by the Pharisees, and "commonly called Nazarenes, who believe in Christ the Son "of God, born of the virgin Mary, and say, that it was he who "suffered under Pontius Pilate, and rose again, in whom also "we believe. But while they wish to be both Jews and Christians, they are neither Jews nor Christians."†

* Vindication, B. 5. c. 5. s. 1. Vol. ii. p. 91.

† Si hoc verum est; in Cherinti et Ebionis hæresim dilabimur, qui credentes in Christo, propter hoc solum a patribus anathematizati sunt, quod legis cærimonias Christi evangelio miscuerunt, et sic nova confessi

Dr. Priestley follows Suicer (in his *Thesaurus*, under the Article, Ebion) in inferring from this passage the identity of the Nazarenes and Ebionites, and says in the third of his *Second Letters to Dr. Horsley*, that if he thought himself at liberty to do it, he could produce, in support of his mode of understanding it, as high a classical authority as any then living in England. Bishop Bull on the contrary (in his *Judicium Ecclesiæ Catholicæ* Cap. 11. sect. 13), whom the *Monthly Reviewer* follows and appeals to, considers this passage as a very clear evidence, (*apertissimum testimonium*), of the difference of these two sects. The passage, which Dr. Priestley renders, 'What shall I say of the Ebionites,' the reviewer translates, 'Why should I speak of the Ebionites,' and supposes Jerom to pass from the mention of them to that of another sect, the Nazarenes. The original is certainly equivocal, and it may be doubted which construction of it is correct.* There is another objection to Dr. Priestley's construction, which he has himself noticed, that he makes Jerom say, "It is—a heresy," instead of "They, i. e. the Ebionites—are a heresy." He considers this however such a trifling inaccuracy, as a writer might very easily fall into. The reviewer of course has a different opinion. Dr. Priestley thinks the characteristics of the Nazarenes and Ebionites as here described to be the same; the one pretended to be Christians, and the other were neither Jews nor

sunt, ut vetera non amitterent. Quid dicam de Hebionitis, qui Christianos esse se simulant? Usque hodie per totas orientis synagogas inter Judæos hæresis est, quæ dicitur Mincorum, et a Pharissæis nunc usque damnatur, quos vulgo Nazaræos nuncupant, qui credunt in Christum, filium dei, natum de virgine Maria, et eum dicunt esse, qui sub Pontio Pilato passus est, et resurrexit, in quem et nos credimus: sed dum volunt et Judæi esse, et Christiani, nec Judæi sunt nec Christiani. Opera, vol. i. p. 634. edit. Victor. 1624.

* The reviewer says, "We maintain that *Quid dicam?* means, Why speak I? or, Why should I speak? The phrase is so common in this sense, that every boy that hath read Terence or Tully's orations, would laugh at a man who should give it the sense Dr. Priestley hath." I cannot say in which sense, whether that of the reviewer or of Dr. Priestley, this phrase is most frequently used in "Tully's orations;" but with regard to Terence, in a very great majority of instances in which it occurs, it is unequivocally determined by the connexion to mean, not, *Why should I speak?* but, *What shall I say?*

Christians. The reviewer thinks, on the contrary, that, 'believing in Christ the Son of God, in whom we also believe,' which is said of the Nazarenes, is a declaration of their orthodox belief in the divinity of the Son, and much more than simply, 'believing in Christ,' as the Ebionites are affirmed to have done. Other arguments are drawn from the reply of Austin, and from the connexion of the passage, but they do not seem to me materially to affect the question.* It may be observed that Spencer, (in his note where the word Ebionites first occurs in the second book of Origen against Celsus,) quotes this passage of Jerom, and gives it the same construction as is done by Suicer, and Dr. Priestley.†

We have thus gone through with the passages produced by Dr. Priestley, except those from Origen; and I shall now notice some other passages brought forward by his opponents, in proof of the orthodoxy of the Nazarenes on the subject of Christ's divinity, and their difference in this respect from the Ebionites.

In the third chapter of his *Remarks on Dr. Priestley's Second Letters*, Dr. Horsley refers to a passage of Jerom, in his commentary on Isaiah viii. where, from an exposition of the thirteenth and fourteenth verses, which Jerom attributes to the Nazarenes, it appears, according to Dr. Horsley, that they acknowledged in Christ, the Lord of Hosts of the Old Testament. "For any thing like a shadow of a proof," says Dr. Priestley, "of this most extraordinary assertion, I a long time looked in vain, and thought the reference must have been misprinted; but at length, considering what kind of a reasoner I had to do with, I believe I discovered your real ideas on the subject.

"The prophet says (ch. viii. 13, 14.) *Sanctify the Lord of Hosts himself, and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread; and he shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling*

* See Monthly Review, vol. 69, pp. 216, 217, 218. Dr. Priestley's remarks on Monthly Review, annexed to First Letters to Dr. Horsley, and Monthly Review, vol. 70. pp. 67, 68, 69.

† Orig. Op. tom. 1. p. 386. Edit. Delarue.

"bling, and for a rock of offence, to both the houses of Israel,
"for a gin and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem.

"In his commentary on this passage, Jerom says, 'the
"Nazarenes (who so received Christ, as not to abandon the
"observance of the old law) interpret these two houses of Sam-
"sai and Hillel, from which arose the scribes and pharisees,
" &c. and that these were the *two houses* which did not receive
"the Saviour, who was to them for a destruction and an of-
"fence.'

"Jerom, however, does not make the inference that you
"do, viz. that because the Nazarenes thought that this proph-
"ecy referred to the times of Christ, and to his rejection by
"the scribes and pharisees, they believed Christ to be the *Lord*
"of Hosts. They only call him *the Saviour*, meaning, proba-
"bly, a person speaking and acting by authority from God,
"who was in reality rejected by those who rejected his mes-
"senger, though a *mere man*. As our Lord himself says,
"Luke x. 6. *He that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that*
"*despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me.* On this ground
"you might rank both the Nazarenes, and all the modern pro-
"fessed unitarians, with believers in the divinity of Christ.
"You might even make them believers in the divinity of the
"apostles, and that of all the preachers of the gospel. But
"having no better evidence of the orthodoxy of the Nazarenes,
"you were obliged to make the best of this, which will prove
"a great deal too much."*

It is likewise contended, that it appears from the commen-
tary of Jerom on Isaiah, that the Nazarenes, though they ob-
served the law, despised the traditions of the pharisees, and
thought highly of St. Paul, and in these respects differed from
the Ebionites, if we receive Epiphanius' account of the latter.
It is not essential to Dr. Priestley's argument to disprove dif-
ferences of this kind, or rather to shew, that the name of Naza-
renes, which was more honorable than that of Ebionites, might
not often be applied in preference by the orthodox writers of
the gentiles, to those Jewish Christians whose sentiments were
to them the least offensive: on subjects for instance such as
those mentioned. I do not find that Dr. Priestley has noticed

* Third Letters to Dr. Horsley. Let. 4.

this argument, which is only very briefly alluded to by Dr. Horsley,* though it is insisted upon by Jamieson and by Michael Lequien, in his seventh dissertation prefixed to the works of Joannes Damascenus, before mentioned in a note.

In speaking of Austin, Dr. Priestley says, (in his *History of Early Opinions*, B. 3. c. 8.) "He himself, in his *Catalogue of heresies*, makes a difference between the Ebionites and "Nazarenes, but by no means that, which makes the latter to "have been believers in the divinity of Christ," and the former "not." Jamieson on the contrary contends, (B. 5. c. 5. s. 1.) that he does expressly make this difference; for Austin says, that the Nazarenes believed Christ to be the Son of God, and that the Ebionites believed him to be only a man.†

* Remarks on Dr. Priestley's Second Letters, P. 2. c. 3.

† It will be seen that the principal evidence for the orthodoxy of the Nazarenes, arises from this form of expression, 'They believe Christ to be the Son of God,' being used concerning them by Epiphanius (in a passage referred to page 242, note); by Jerom (in the quotation given page 246); by Austin (in the passage just referred to), and by Joannes Damascenus, (as before mentioned, page 245). To this argument, whatever may be its force, I do not know, that Dr. Priestley made any direct reply. It is obvious enough to remark, that it is not said, in *what sense*, they believed Christ to be the Son of God, and it is strange, that if they were really orthodox on the subject of his divinity, that no unequivocal declaration of their orthodoxy is any where to be found. As the application of the title, Son of God, to our Saviour, is, of course, common to all Christians, it cannot of itself imply any belief of his divinity. With regard to this title, Dr. Priestley, while treating another subject, in the eleventh of his Second Letters to Dr. Horsley, makes the following observations.

"With respect to Nathaniel's calling Jesus the *Son of God*, this phrase "was, in the mouth of a Jew, synonymous to the *Messiah*, or *Son of David*, "and it is fully explained by the subsequent expression of Nathaniel himself, viz. *King of Israel*, and therefore, the Jewish doctors, expecting "nothing more in their Messiah than a glorious *King of Israel*, such as "David had been, could not give any satisfactory reason why David "should call him *Lord*, having no notion of his spiritual kingdom, extending to all mankind. If the mere appellation *Son of God*, implies equality "with God, Adam must have been a God, for he is called the son of God, "Luke iii. 38. Solomon also must have been God; and so must all Christians, for they are called *sons of God*. 1. John, iii. 2. John i. 12. Rom. "viii. 14. Phil. ii. 15.

"As you are so intimately acquainted with the Fathers, you must have "known the construction that Chrysostom puts upon the language of Na-

I believe, that I have thus given a view of all the principal evidence, that can be produced, either for the identity or the

"daniel; and as he was unquestionably orthodox, I should have thought that it
"might have had some weight with you. He says, that 'in this speech Nathan-
"iel confessed Christ as a man, as appears by his adding, *Thou art the King of*
"*Israel*.' In John, Opera, vol. viii. p. 106."

But one of the strongest arguments against the orthodoxy of the Nazarenes being inferred from the declarations of the fathers above noticed, arises from the connexion, in which they are made by the three writers of principal authority. In the passage of Jerom, in which he speaks of the Nazarenes, as believing Christ to be the Son of God, it seems to be at least very doubtful, whether he has not confounded them with the Ebionites.

With regard to Austin, in his work on heresies he says—"The Cerinthians say, that the world was made by angels.... They affirm that Christ was
"only a man, that he did not arise from the dead, and that he will not arise....
"The Nazarenes, while they believe Christ to be the Son of God, yet observe
"all the rites of the law.... The Ebionites *also* say, that Christ is only a man."* Epiphanius likewise, in the Synopsis prefixed to the second tome of his first book against heresies, in which he speaks of the Nazarenes, as believing Jesus to be the Son of God, introduces them, as is done by Austin, between the Cerinthians and the Ebionites, and begins his account of the Ebionites with saying—"They
"are very nearly allied to the sects just mentioned, the Cerinthians and the Nazarenes."† It should be noticed likewise, that Epiphanius must have contradicted himself, if he intended here to assert the orthodox belief of the Nazarenes on the article in question. The reason why they are said by the writers before-mentioned to have believed Christ to be the Son of God, seems to be from the notion; that they had an higher opinion concerning him, still however with the belief of his being a man only, than some of the other sects, who likewise entertained this belief. Mosheim, as quoted by Dr. Horsley in his sixth letter to Dr. Priestley, says, they "had a better and truer notion of Christ, than the Ebionites," though he by no means thinks, that their belief concerning him can be proved to be orthodox. Epiphanius, just before declaring his doubt, whether or not they believed the miraculous conception, says of them—"They profess that
"there is one God, and that Jesus Christ is his child, (*παῖδα*),"‡ to which passage he very probably refers in his Synopsis, when he says that they believed him to be the Son of God.

* Cerinthiani a Cerintho, idemque Merinthiani a Merintho, mundum ab angelis factum esse docentes, et carne circumcidi oportere, atque alia hujusmodi legia præcepta servari. Jesum hominem tantummodo fuisse, nec surrexisse, nec resurrecturum asseverantes. Mille quoque . . . &c. Nazaræi cum dei filium confiteantur esse Christum, omnia tamen veteris legis observant, quæ Christiani, per Apostolicam traditionem, non observare carnaliter, sed spiritualiter intelligere, didicerunt. Hebionæ Christum etiam tantummodo hominem dicunt. Augustin de Hæresibus. Op. vol. vi. col. 15. edit. Frobenii. 1556.

† Εβωνίται, οἱ παραπληροῖσι τῶν προσημασμένων Χρηθιανῶν καὶ Ναζαρενῶν.

‡ . . . ὅτι οἱ Θεοὶ καταγγέλλουσι, καὶ τοὶ τῆς παιδὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

difference of the Nazarenes and Ebionites, except that of Origen, which I am about to explain, and except that it may be contended, that they were two different sects on the ground of their having used different copies of the Hebrew Gospel of St. Matthew. Whether however there were any difference in their copies is very uncertain. Jerom, who seems to have known more of the Hebrew Gospel of St. Matthew, than any one else, speaks of that used by the Nazarenes and Ebionites as being the same.

We come now to the testimony of Origen. It is not, as I have before observed, merely in proof of the identity of the Nazarenes and Ebionites; but in immediate proof of the main proposition, that the primitive faith of the Hebrew Church was unitarian.

In his second Book against Celsus, Origen, as translated by Dr. Horsley,* says,—“they of the Jews, who believe in Christ, have not abandoned the law of their ancestors, for they live according to it; bearing a name, which corresponds with the poor expectation, which the law holds out. For a beggar is called among the Jews, Ebion. And they of the Jews, who have received Jesus as the Christ, go by the name of Ebionæ-ans” [Ebionites]. In his fifth book against Celsus he says, that there are some, who, because they have received Jesus, therefore boast that they are Christians, but who yet, like the Jews, observe the Jewish law; “these,” he continues (to use Dr. Horsley’s translation*); “are the double Ebionites, who either confess Jesus born of a virgin, *in like manner as we do*, “(*ἐποικίζουσιν ἡμῶν*), or think that he was not born in that manner, but “like other men.” The first of these passages is produced in the second of Dr. Priestley’s First Letters to Dr. Horsley; the second is referred to in the first section of his first Reply to the Monthly Reviewer. They are not all the passages produced from Origen; but they are all that Dr. Horsley has noticed in his Letters to Dr. Priestley.

With regard to these passages, Dr. Horsley first contends or rather asserts, that Ebionites in the first of them does not mean proper Ebionites but something quite different—“al-

* Letters to Dr. Priestley, Let. 7.

"though," says he, "the Christians of the circumcision in general are in this passage called Ebionites; it is according to a peculiar definition of the word, which includes not what by other writers always, and by Origen himself in other places, is included in the notion of the Ebionæan doctrine; namely, a denial of our Lord's divinity. The Nazarenes therefore might be Ebionites, in the sense which is here given to that word, although they doubted not our Lord's divinity, and were quite another set of people than the proper Ebionites."*

In reply to the objection which he supposes may be made, that Origen in the second passage has explained what he means by Ebionites, he says—"If I could admit the universality of the name upon Origen's testimony, I should insist that his description of the two-fold Ebionites, in the fifth book, is not exactly what you take it to be. I should remark, that the words, *ὡς ἡμεῖς*, 'in like manner as we do,' make an important branch of the character of the milder sort . . . I should contend, that Origen affirms, but with less equivocation, of these better Ebionites, what Epiphanius reluctantly confesses of the Nazarenes, that they held the Catholic doctrine concerning the nature of our Lord."*

There is great virtue, according to Dr. Horsley, in this *ὡς ἡμεῖς* ('in like manner as we do'). I believe however it can hardly be maintained, that there is more force in the Greek words, than in the English words, "who believe like us, that Jesus was born of a virgin."†

But Dr. Horsley, not quite satisfied with these answers,

* Letters to Dr. Priestley, Let. 7.

† With regard to the inconsistency of supposing the Nazarenes believers in the Divinity of Christ, and at the same time one class of the Ebionites, may be consulted a part of a note on p. 233. In addition to what is there said, it may be remembered, that those, who endeavour to distinguish between the Nazarenes and Ebionites, make one point of difference to have been, that the latter rejected the apostle Paul, which the former did not. But Origen, near the end of his fifth book against Celsus, makes this rejection of St. Paul to have been characteristic of both classes of Ebionites. "There are," says he, "some sects, who do not receive the epistles of the apostle Paul, as both kind of Ebionites." [*οὗτοι γὰρ τῶν αἰρετικῶν τὰς Πάυλου ἐπιστολὰς μὴ παραδέχονται, ὡς τῆς Εβιονταίας ἀμφοτέρω*] Orig. Op. tom. iv. p. 628. Edit. Delarue.

takes at length a more direct mode of getting rid of this evidence.—“ In this manner,” he says, “ I should combat your argument from these two passages; were it not that I think too lightly of the testimony of Origen, in what relates to the Hebrew Christians, to be solicitous to turn it to my own advantage. Let his words be taken as you understand them; and so far as the faith of the Hebrew Christians of his own time is in question, let him appear as an evidence on your side.—I shall take what you may think a bold step. I shall tax the veracity of your witness—of this Origen. I shall tell you, that whatever may be the general credit of his character, yet in this business the particulars of his deposition are to be little regarded, when he sets out with the allegation of a notorious falsehood. He alleges of the Hebrew Christians in general, that they had not renounced the Mosaic law. The assertion served him for an answer to the invective, which Celsus had put in the mouth of a Jew against the converted Jews, as deserters of the laws and customs of their ancestors. The answer was not the worse for wanting truth, if his Hea-then antagonist was not sufficiently informed in the true distinctions of Christian sects, to detect the falsehood. But in all the time which he spent in Palestine, had Origen never conversed with Hebrew Christians of another sort? Had he met with no Christians of Hebrew families, of the church of Jerusalem? Was the Mosaic law observed, was it tolerated, in Origen’s days, in the church of Jerusalem, when that church was under the government of Bishops of the uncircumcision? The fact is, that after the demolition of Jerusalem by Adrian, the majority of the Hebrew Christians, who must have passed for Jews with the Roman magistrates, had they continued to adhere to the Mosaic Law, which to this time they had observed more from habit than from any principle of conscience, made no scruple to renounce it; that they might be qualified to partake in the valuable privileges of the *Ælian Colony*, from which Jews were excluded. Having thus divested themselves of the form of Judaism, which to that time they had borne, they removed from Pella, and other towns to which they had retired, and settled in great numbers at *Ælia*.

"The few, who retained a superstitious veneration for their law, remained in the North of Galilee, where they were joined perhaps by new fugitives of the same weak character from Palestine. And this was the beginning of the sect of the Nazarenes. But from this time, whatever Origen may pretend to serve a purpose, the majority of the Hebrew Christians forsook their law, and lived in communion with the Gentile Bishops of the new-modeled church of Jerusalem; for the name was retained, though Jerusalem was no more, and the seat of the Bishop was at Ælia. All this I affirm with the less hesitation, being supported by the authority of Mosheim.* From whom indeed I learnt first to rate the testimony of Origen, in this particular question, at its true value.† . . . Were the Hebrew Christians," asks Dr. Horsley, "living in communion with the Bishop of Jerusalem, in the days of Origen, no part of the true church of Christ? If they were a part of it, in Origen's own judgment they were no Ebionites. 'I would not believe this witness upon his oath,' says Mosheim, 'vending as he manifestly does, such flimsy lies.'‡

This then is in general the statement of Dr. Horsley, by which he thinks Origen's account, that all the Jews were Ebionites, contradicted, and rendered notoriously false. It is, that the Jews, after the rebuilding of Jerusalem by Adrian, and the change of its name to Ælia Capitolina, being banished from the new city by an edict of that emperor, many Jewish Christians, who had hitherto observed the rites of the law, now renounced them, that they might not be confounded with Jews, and returned from their dispersion during the war of Adrian against the Jews, and settled in the new city; that having thus renounced the law, they were not Ebionites, but perfectly orthodox; that Origen therefore has asserted what he must have known to be false, in saying of the Jewish Christians without exception, that they were Ebionites, and retained the law of their ances-

* "De rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum. Sec. II. § 38. Not."

† "See his Dissertation about Ebion, which is the tenth in order in the First Volume of a Collection, intitled, *Dissertationes ad Historiam Ecclesiasticam pertinentes*."

‡ Letters to Dr. Priestley, Let. 7.

tors; and that he made this assertion to serve a present purpose, writing, as he was, in controversy against Celsus, the celebrated opponent of Christianity.

After giving what I have quoted from Dr. Horsley, Dr. Priestley thus proceeds in the fourth of his Second Letters: "Struck with this extraordinary narration, of a transaction of ancient times, for which you refer to no authority besides that of Mosheim, I looked into him; but even there I do not find all the particulars that you mention. He says nothing of the Jewish Christians having observed their law more from habit than any principle of conscience; nothing of their making no scruple to renounce their law, in order to partake in the privileges of the *Ælian* colony; nothing of any Jewish Christians removing from Pella and settling in *Ælia*; nothing of the retiring of the rest to the north of Galilee; or of this new origin of the Nazarenes there."*—He then observes, that for these particulars, Dr. Horsley must have had some other authority in reserve, than that of Mosheim, and that he ought to have produced it. Dr. Horsley in reply repels with indignation the charge of making these additions to Mosheim's account. If Dr. Priestley "opened Mosheim," he says, "in the place to which I referred, he must know that I have added no circumstance to Mosheim's account; but such as every one must add, in his own imagination, who admits Mosheim's representation of the fact in its principal parts. He must know, that three circumstances in particular, which he is pleased to mention among my additions, are affirmed by Mosheim: the conflux of Hebrew Christians to *Ælia*; the motive, which induced the majority to give up their ancient customs; namely, the desire of sharing in the privileges of the *Ælian* colony; and the retreat of those, who could not bring themselves to give their ancient customs up, to remote corners of the country"†

With regard to one of these circumstances Dr. Priestley is in error. Mosheim does suppose that numbers of Jewish Christians removed from Pella and settled in *Ælia*. With regard to the other two, as stated by him in the language Dr.

* Second Letters to Dr. Horsley, Let. 4.

† Remarks, c. 2.

Horsley first used, which it is necessary to observe that he does not repeat, Dr. Priestley is correct. Mosheim does not say, that the Jewish Christians *made no scruple* to renounce their law, &c. which is undoubtedly what Dr. Priestley had in mind as Dr. Horsley's addition. Mosheim says that he would not have it thought, that these Jewish Christians renounced their law merely for the sake of temporal advantage. But that probably Mark, who was afterward chosen their bishop, convinced them by powerful arguments, that its authority was no longer binding, though his arguments would have had less effect upon men accustomed from infancy to its observance, if they had not been strengthened by the desire of partaking of the privileges of the *Ælian* colony. Of the retirement of those, who did not renounce the law, "to the North of Galilee," as Dr. Horsley first stated, or "to remote corners of the country," as he now writes, Mosheim says nothing; he only states them to have separated from those, who had given up the law (*a societate eorum, qui legi nuntium miserant, recessisse*).

But to return to the main question:—"Mosheim," says Dr. Priestley, "who began this accusation of Origen, produces no authority in his dissertations for his assertion. He only says that he cannot reconcile the fact, that Origen mentions, [the fact of all the Jewish Christians being Ebionites,] with his seeming unwillingness to allow the Ebionites to be Christians. But this is easily accounted for from the attachment which he himself had to the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, which they denied; and from their holding no communion with other Christians."

"All the appearance of authority, that I can find in any ancient writer, of the Jewish Christians deserting the law of their ancestors, is in Sulpicius Severus, to whom I am referred by Mosheim in his history. But what he says on the subject, is only what follows: 'At this time Adrian, thinking that he should destroy Christianity by destroying the place, erected the images of *dæmons* in the church, and in the place of our Lord's sufferings; and because the Christians were thought to consist chiefly of Jews (for then the church at Jerusalem had all its clergy of the circumcision) ordered a co-

"hort of soldiers to keep constant guard, and drive all Jews from any access to Jerusalem, which was of service to the Christian faith; for at that time they almost all believed Christ to be God,* but with the observance of the law; the Lord so disposing it, that the servitude of the law should be removed from the liberty of the faith, and of the church. Then was Marc the first bishop of the Gentiles at Jerusalem.†

"Where, Sir, do you find, in this passage, any promise of immunities to the Jewish Christians, if they would forsake the law of their fathers? On the contrary, the historian says, that the object of Adrian was to overturn Christianity, and that the Jews were banished because the Christians then were chiefly of that nation. According to this account, all the Jews, Christians as well as others, were driven out of Jerusalem; and nothing is said of any of them forsaking the law of Moses: and your assertion of their having been gradually prepared for it, by having before this time observed their law more from habit than conscience, is unsupported by any authority or probability. Eusebius mentions the expulsion of the Jews from Jerusalem, but says not a word of any of the Christians there abandoning circumcision, and their other ceremonies on that occasion. Indeed, such a thing was in the highest degree improbable.

"Independent of all natural probability, had Sulpitius Sev-

* This expression of Sulpitius Severus, Dr. Priestley regards like the other general assertions of the orthodoxy of the primitive church by the Christian Fathers. They of course maintained, that the Church in very early times held the same belief, which was held by them. Sulpitius Severus lived in Gaul at the close of the fourth and beginning of the fifth century.

† "Qua tempestate Adrianus, existimans se Christianam fidem loci injuria perempturum, et in templo ac loco dominicæ passionis demonum simulachra constituit. Et quia Christiani ex Judæis potissimum putabantur (namque tum Hierosolymæ non nisi ex circumcissione habebat ecclesia Sacerdotem) militum cohortem custodias in perpetuum agitare jussit, quæ Judæos omnes Hierosolymæ aditus arceret. Quod quidem Christianæ fidei proficiebat; quia tum pene omnes Christum Deum sub legis observatione credebant. Nimirum id domino ordinante dispositum, ut legis servitus a libertate fidei atque ecclesiæ tolleretur. Ita tum primum Marcus ex Gentibus apud Hierosolymam episcopus fuit. Hist. lib. II. c. xxxi. p. 245."

“crus actually written all that Mosheim advances, and all the
“curious particulars that you have added to complete the ac-
“count; whether is it, Sir, from this writer, or from Origen,
“that we are more likely to gain information on this subject
“Origen writing in controversy, and of course subject to cor-
“rection, appeals to a fact as notorious in the country in which
“he himself resided, and in his own times, to which therefore
“he could not but have given particular attention. Whereas
“Sulpitius Severus lived in the remotest part of Gaul, several
“thousand miles from Palestine; and two hundred years after
“Origen, so that he could not have ascertained the fact as from his
“own knowledge, and he quotes no other person for it. But
“in fact Sulpitius Severus is no more favourable to your ac-
“count of the matter than Origen himself; so that to the au-
“thority of both of them; of all ancient testimony, and natural
“probability, you have nothing to oppose but your own con-
“jectures, and nothing to plead for this conduct, but that your
“poor and wretched cause requires it.”*

In the second of his Third Letters to Dr. Horsley, Dr. Priestley appeals to, and partly quotes a passage in Eusebius,† the whole of which is equally to his purpose, as the preceding from Sulpitius Severus. But though he has made that use of the passage, which it may seem clearly to justify, he has not quoted the whole of it; nor that part which is perhaps most decisive in his favor. The whole passage is as follows:—“From that time,” says Eusebius, [i. e. from the time when the Jewish insurrection was suppressed by Adrian] “the
“whole nation were prohibited from entering the country about
“Jerusalem, by the express order of Adrian, who did not even
“permit them to see their native soil from a distance; as Aristo
“Pellæus relates. The city being in this manner emptied of
“the nation of the Jews, and all its ancient inhabitants driven
“away, was resettled by foreigners, and became a Roman city;
“its name was changed to *Ælia*, in honor of the emperor *Æ-*
“*lius* Adrian; and the church there being composed of Gen-

* Second Letters to Dr. Horsley, Let. 4-

† This passage is not quoted in his *History of Early Opinions*.

"files, Mark first ministered among them after the bishops of
"the circumcision."*

To the authorities already quoted, not much will be added by that of Nicephorus, (a writer of Ecclesiastical history of the fourteenth century,) who, however, is incidentally adduced by Dr. Priestley in his History of Early Opinions; and who says, "that Adrian caused Jerusalem to be inhabited by Greeks only, and permitted no others to live in it,† Dr. Priestley likewise says, "that the members of this church were not Jews but Greeks, I think indisputable from this plain consideration, "that after the time of Adrian the bishops of that church were Greeks, and that the language in which the public offices were performed was Greek; whereas, immediately before the bishops had been Hebrews, and the public offices had been "in the Hebrew tongue."‡

"Having consulted Eusebius and other ancient writers to "no purpose," says Dr. Priestley in the fourth of his Second Letters to Dr. Horsley, "for some account of these Jews, who "had deserted the religion of their ancestors, I looked into "Tillemont, who is wonderfully careful and exact in bringing "together every thing that relates to his subject; but his account of the matter differs widely indeed from Mosheim's "and yours. He says, (Hist. des Empereurs, tom. II. part. "ii. p. 506.) 'The Jews converted to the faith of Christ were "not excepted by Adrian from the prohibition to continue at "Jerusalem. They were obliged to go out with the rest. But "the Jews being then obliged to abandon Jerusalem, that

* "Το πᾶν ἔθνος ἐξ ἑκείνου καὶ τῆς περὶ τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα γῆς παρῆκεν ἐπὶ τοῦ
"καὶ οὐρεῖται· ἵνα μὴ δογματῇ καὶ διαταξίῃσι Ἀδριανῷ, ὡς αὐτὸς ἔξ ἀποκτε
"νῶν τοὺς πατρίους ἰθαφές, ἐγκαταλείπειν· Ἀριστὶ ὁ Παύλος ἴσχει. ὅτι
"ὁ δὲ τῆς πόλεως οἱ ἱσχυροὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθους, καὶ παντὶ τῷ πάλαι
"ἐκπατρίστῳ ἔλθουσιν, ἐξ ἀλλοφυλῶν τι γένος συνεισπράττειν, ἢ μετὰ πᾶσι
"ῥωμαίων πόλιν τὴν ἑσπέρην ἀμείψασθαι, οἷς τῇ τῷ κεραιτῷ Αἰλίου Ἀδριανῷ
"τιμῇ, Αἰλίου προσηγορεύεται· καὶ ὁ δὲ τῆς αὐτοῦ ἐκκλησίας ἐξ ὧν συνέρχεται
"ἔσσης, πρῶτος μετὰ τῆς ἐκ πλείονος ἐπισκοπῆς, τῶν τῶν ἑκείνῃ λυτῶν
"ἐγγιγνέται Μάρκος. (Hist. Lib. 4. c. 6.)"

† Hist. Lib. iii. cap. 24. vol. i. p. 256.

‡ Third Letters to Dr. Horsley, Let. 2.

"church began to be composed of Gentiles; and before the death of Adrian, in the middle of the year 138, Marc, who was of Gentile race, was established their bishop.' He does not say with Mosheim, that this Marc was chosen by the 'Jews who abandoned the Mosaic rites.' (Hist. vol. i. p. 172.)

"Fleury, I find, had the same idea of that event. He says, (Hist. vol. i. p. 326.) 'From this time the Jews were forbidden to enter Jerusalem, or even to see it at a distance. The city being afterwards inhabited by Gentiles, had no other name than *Ælia*.—Hitherto the church of Jerusalem had only been composed of Jewish converts, who observed the ritual of the law under the liberty of the gospel; but then as the Jews were forbidden to remain there, and guards were placed to defend the entrance of it, there were no other Christians there besides those who were of Gentile origin; and thus the remains of the servitude of the law were entirely abolished.

"Thus," says Dr. Priestley, "ends this church of orthodox Jewish Christians at Jerusalem, planted by Mosheim, and pretty well watered by the Archdeacon of St. Albans."

I have thought it as well to produce at once the whole of the direct proof, that no such church of orthodox Jews, as Mosheim and Dr. Horsley suppose, ever existed at Jerusalem, or, as it was then called, *Ælia Capitolina*. Dr. Priestley in his first reply to Dr. Horsley concerning it, that is in the fourth of his Second Letters, rests his argument principally on the two passages from those letters, one of which I have just quoted, and the other of which is quoted pp. 257, 258, 259.

Thus however as Dr. Priestley expected, did not end the church of orthodox Jews at Jerusalem. In the second chapter of his Remarks upon Dr. Priestley's Second Letters, Dr. Horsley lays down six propositions concerning it, which, says he, "I take for granted." The whole of these six propositions however, as far as they have any bearing upon the argument, amounts to nothing more, than a repetition of Dr. Horsley's former assertion, that the Jewish church at Jerusalem had observed the law as a matter of mere habit, and national prejudice, and not as a matter of conscience, and therefore that a desire

of enjoying the privileges of the *Ælian* colony, from which Jews were excluded, would prevail upon the Hebrew Christians, who constituted this church; and those of other parts of Palestine, to divest themselves of the form of Judaism, by laying aside their ancient customs. The six propositions are given in the margin below.* This hypothesis however, as is evident,

* "I take for granted, then," says Dr. Horsley, "these things.

"I. A Church of Hebrew Christians, adhering to the observance of the Mosaic Law, subsisted for a time at Jerusalem, and for some time at Pella, from the beginning of Christianity until the final dispersion of the Jews by Adrian.

"II. Upon this event, a Christian church arose at *Ælia*.

"III. The church of *Ælia*, often, but improperly, called the church of Jerusalem, for Jerusalem was no more; the church of *Ælia* in its external form, that is, in its doctrines and its discipline, was a Greek church; and it was governed by bishops of the uncircumcision. In this my adversary and I are agreed. The point in dispute between us is, of what members the church of *Ælia* was composed. He says, of converts of Gentile extraction. I say, of Hebrews: of the very same persons, in the greater part, who were members of the ancient Hebrew church, at the time when the Jews were subdued by Adrian. For again, I take for granted,

"IV. That the observation of the Mosaic law, in the primitive church of Jerusalem, was a matter of mere habit and national prejudice, not of conscience. A matter of conscience it could not be; because the decree of the apostolical college, and the writings of St. Paul, must have put every true believer's conscience at ease upon the subject. St. Paul, in all his epistles, maintains the total insignificance of the Mosaic law, either for Jew or Gentile, after Christ had made the great atonement; and the notion that St. Paul could be mistaken, in a point which is the principal subject of a great part of his writings, is an impiety, which I cannot impute to our holy brethren, the saints of the primitive church of Jerusalem.† Again, I take for granted,

"V. That with good Christians, such as I believe the Christians of the primitive church of Jerusalem to have been; motives of worldly interest, which would not overcome conscience, would, nevertheless, overcome mere habit.

"VI. That the desire of partaking in the privileges of the *Ælian* colony, from which Jews were excluded, would accordingly be a motive, that would prevail with the Hebrew Christians of Jerusalem, and other parts of Palestine, to divest themselves of the form of Judaism, by laying aside their ancient customs.

† "By the primitive church of Jerusalem, I mean the Hebrew church before Adrian. The retreat to Pella was temporary; and, I am inclined to think, of short duration; and the bishop, while he sat there, was still called the bishop of Jerusalem.

depends upon a supposition, which is contradicted by the authorities alleged, that is, Dr. Horsley must suppose, that it was not Jews by nation, but Jews by religion only, who were driven from Palestine. It is scarcely worth while therefore to mention another objection to it, which is, that the attachment of Jewish Christians to their law seems to have been much stronger, than he would represent it. Even in the days of the apostles, it was said of the members of the church at Jerusalem,—“Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are, which believe; and they are all zealous of the law.”*

The only ancient authority which Dr. Horsley produces in his favor, is a passage of Orosius (about A. D. 416), who says, that Adrian “ordered, that no Jew should be permitted to enter Jerusalem, that licence being only enjoyed by Christians.”† It may be doubted, perhaps, whether Orosius did not mean, as Dr. Priestley understands the passage, (in the second of his Third Letters to Dr. Horsley,) to Christians who were not Jews. Dr. Horsley however proceeds—“Was Orosius too late a writer to give evidence about these transactions? The historian of Corruptions is, I believe, some centuries later. His means of information therefore are fewer; and, were he well informed, his precipitance in assertion, and his talent of accommodating his story to his opinions, should annihilate the credit of his evidence. The testimony of Orosius, however inconsiderable, might of itself therefore outweigh the opinion of Dr. Priestley; if a feather only, in the one scale, be more than a counterpoise for a nothing in the other.”

These remarks would undoubtedly have been much more pointed, if Dr. Priestley had produced himself, as Orosius is produced, as an-original authority on this subject of history.

Dr. Horsley next objects to the account of Sulpitius, who says that Adrian meant to destroy Christianity. He says that Adrian “was not unfavourable to the Christians,” and issued rescripts in their favor. The rescript however, to which Dr. Horsley refers,‡ does not say, what he is willing to make it

* Acts xxi. 20.

† Hist. Lib. vii. c. 13.

‡ This rescript is to be found at the end of Justin Martyr's longer Apology, or in Eusebius' Hist. Lib. iv. c. 9. where see likewise the note of Valesius.

say; and seems to amount to nothing more than what Dr. Priestley explains it in his reply; that none were "to be punished as Christians, till they were proved to be so."

Dr. Horsley further says, that the Christians did not join in the insurrection with the Jews; that Barchochebas, the leader of the Jews, persecuted the Christians; and beside that it seems to have been the case, that Judaism was particularly obnoxious to the Roman court at this time; and therefore it is highly probable, that the emperor should make a distinction between Jews, (that is, Jews by religion,) and Christians.

Dr. Horsley next notices the assertion which he had made, of the return of Hebrew Christians from Pella to Jerusalem, after the wars of Adrian. "It happens," says he, "that this fact, of which Dr. Priestley does me the honor to make me the inventor, is asserted by Epiphanius." After quoting Epiphanius however, he manifests somewhat more distrust in his authority. "Whether this return," [spoken of by Epiphanius] he then says, "of the Christians of Jerusalem from Pella took place in the interval between the end of Titus's war and the commencement of Adrian's, or after the end of Adrian's, is a matter of no importance. It is sufficient for my purpose, that these returned Christians were residing at Jerusalem, or more properly at Ælia, at the same time that Aquila was residing there as overseer of the emperor's works. Let not the public therefore be abused by any cavils, which ignorance or fraud may raise, about the chronology of the return."

The concluding caution is somewhat curious, and the assertion, that it is of no consequence, whether or not a quoted authority support the fact for which it is adduced, is still more so. Relying however upon this authority, Dr. Horsley concludes what relates to the subject of this return, in the following manner—"The confidence, with which he [Dr. Priestley] mentions this as a fact forged by me, is only one instance, out of a great number, of his own shameless intrepidity in assertion." He then begins the next paragraph thus—"But to return from the detection of Dr. Priestley's fiction to the historical discussion."

"It is not to be refused," says Jamieson, meaning, it is not

to be denied, "that the destruction mentioned by Epiphanius seems to be that of Titus."* This is what is said by Dr. Priestley in reply, and what Dr. Horsley seems to have had sufficient knowledge could be said with truth. The passage which he has quoted therefore, is nothing to his purpose. That there were Hebrew Christians residing at Jerusalem before the wars of Adrian, is not disputed; what is to be proved is, that there were Hebrew Christians residing there after the conclusion of those wars, who in consequence of his Edict had renounced the rites of the law.

In one of his additional notes, Dr. Horsley remarks on Dr. Priestley's reply respecting this return of the Christians from Pella to Jerusalem. In this he explains what he had before said, that it was of no consequence, whether this return took place after the wars of Titus, or those of Adrian. Epiphanius says, that the celebrated Aquila conversed with Christians, who had returned from Pella, at the time, that he was superintendant of Adrian's works at Ælia, and was converted by them to Christianity. "At this time therefore," says Dr. Horsley, "there were Hebrew Christians settled at Ælia, or they could not then have conversed with Aquila. I maintain, that there is no reason to believe that the Hebrew Christians quietly settled at Ælia, before the Jewish rebellion, were included in "Adrian's edict for the banishment of the Jews." If the only purpose, for which Dr. Horsley had originally professed to use the passage quoted by him from Epiphanius, had been to prove, that there were Hebrew Christians in Jerusalem, or, as it was then called, Ælia, before the edict of Adrian, this use of it would not have been denied him; though the fact not being controverted, it might have been thought an unnecessary citation.

As a further proof, or as he says, "to complete the proof," that there was, in the time of Origen, a church of Jews at Jerusalem, who had renounced the law; Dr. Horsley lays down a seventh proposition, which is—"That a thodox
" Christians of the Hebrews were actually world

* Vindication, B. 5. c. 6. §. 2. II.

"much later, than in the time of Adrian." The proof of this proposition, Dr. Horsley rests upon a passage of Jerom in his commentary on the ninth chapter of Isaiah, where he gives, as Dr. Horsley contends, two different expositions of the same prophecy, ascribing one to "Hebrews believing in Christ," the other to the Nazarenes. "The character," says Dr. Horsley, "given of these Hebrews, that 'they believed in Christ,' without any thing to distinguish their belief from the common belief of the church, without any note of its error or imperfection, is a plain character of complete orthodoxy." Being thus orthodox, and thus distinguished by Jerom from the Nazarenes, they were not observers of the Mosaic law. Previous therefore to the time of Jerom, Hebrews believing in Christ must have renounced their law. But they would not have done this without some powerful motive. Now there is no event recorded, so likely to induce them to do this, and thus to divest themselves of the external character of Jews, as the banishment of all Jews from Jerusalem in the time of Adrian. Probably therefore, argues Dr. Horsley, these completely orthodox Hebrew Christians then renounced their law, and continued to reside at Jerusalem from that period to the time of Jerom.

Dr. Priestley, who gives the whole passage of Jerom, which Dr. Horsley had not produced, replies, that it does not certainly appear, that these "Hebrews believing in Christ," were different from the Nazarenes, or, that Jerom meant more than to vary his expression; or if he alluded to some difference, it does not appear, that he considered the former as more orthodox than the latter; and even if it were to be allowed, that they were completely orthodox, there is no proof that they resided at Jerusalem, and there constituted a part of that church, whose existence Dr. Horsley was endeavouring to establish.*

The sixth and last of Dr. Horsley's disquisitions is occupied about this passage of Jerom and the other from the same author, formerly mentioned,† as alluded to by him respecting the Nazarenes. The disquisition is principally occupied in proving, that there was, in Jerom's opinion, a difference between

* Third Letter to Dr. Horsley, Let. 4.

† pp. 248, 249.

the Hebrews believing in Christ, mentioned by him, and the Nazarenes; and in replying to some incidental and collateral remarks of Dr. Priestley, which I have not thought of sufficient importance to be noticed. It concludes however in the following manner:—"The disturbed foundations of the church of *Ælia* are again settled. I could wish to trust them to their own solidity to withstand any future attacks. I could wish to take my final leave of this unpleasing task, of hunting an uninformed, uncandid adversary through the mazes of his blunders, and the subterfuges of his sophistry. But I have found by the experience of this conflict, that a person once engaging in controversy, is not entirely at liberty to choose for himself to what length he will carry the dispute, and when he will desist. I perceive, that I was guilty of indiscretion in discovering an early aversion to the continuance of the contest. My adversary, perhaps, would have been less hardy in assertion, and more circumspect in argument, had I not given him reason to expect, that every assertion would pass uncontradicted, and every argument uncanvassed. Unambitious, therefore, as I still remain of the honor of the last word, be it however understood that if Dr. Priestley should think proper to make any further defence, or any new attack, I am not pledged either to reply or to be silent."

Such is the style, in which Dr. Horsley concludes this part of the controversy, in which, in opposition to the direct and repeated assertion of Origen, whom he charges with premeditated falsehood; to the express testimony of the historians, Eusebius and Sulpitius Severus; and to the high modern authority of Tillemont and Fleury; he in fact opposes nothing, but his own hypotheses; the name of Mosheim; an equivocal quotation from Orosius; a story of Epiphanius,* of which he abandons the only explanation, which might favor his purpose; and

* Dr. Priestley expresses his doubts, which I have not before mentioned, of the authenticity of this story of Epiphanius, who was a very credulous writer. Michael Lequien, in his seventh dissertation, in defense of the orthodoxy of the Nazarenes, prefixed to the works of Joannes Damascenus, which I have before mentioned in these notes, has occasion to notice this relation, and observes concerning it, that he shall say nothing with regard to the credit of the story, which by most learned men is con-

a passage of Jerom, which, if his own interpretation of it be allowed, is but very remotely connected with his argument.

But the attempt was made by Dr. Horsley to invalidate the testimony of Origen, not merely by establishing the proof of a fact contrary to what he has asserted, but also by shewing that he has contradicted himself. In the beginning of his second book against Celsus, Origen says, as before quoted, 'that the Jews believing in Christ had not renounced their Judaism.' This assertion is made in answer to a reproach upon the converted Jews, which Celsus had put in the mouth of an unbelieving Jew, that by embracing Christianity, they were deserters of their ancient law. Not long after, that is, in the third section of the same book, in treating the same subject, it is said that Origen has directly contradicted what he had said in the first section; for the following passage occurs, according to the translation of Dr. Horsley. "And how confusedly," says Origen, "does Celsus's Jew speak upon this subject? when he might have said more plausibly, some of you *have relinquished the old customs* upon pretence of expositions and allegories. Some again, expounding, as you call it, spiritually, nevertheless observe the institutions of our ancestors. But some, not admitting these expositions, are willing to receive Jesus as the person foretold by the prophets, and to observe the law of Moses according to the ancient customs, as having in the letter the whole meaning of the spirit.'—In these words," says Dr. Horsley, "Origen confesses all that I have alleged of him. He confesses, in contradiction to his former assertion, that he knew of three sorts of Jews professing Christianity. One considered as a fable. [Verum, ut huicce narrationi parcam, quæ viris doctissimis ad fabulas amandanda visa est.]

As the authority of Lequien does in fact add nothing to the evidence already produced, I do not know whether it be worth while to mention, that in this dissertation he likewise asserts the church of Jerusalem after the time of Adrian to have been composed of Gentiles; and seems to have had no notion of the distinction made by Dr. Horsley, between Jews by religion, and Jews by nation. I will quote a single sentence. "Quo factum est, ut Episcopi Hierosolymitani deinceps ["expulsis patrio solo quibuscumque Judeis,"] ex Gentilibus ac Græcis, qui Christi fidem amplexi erant, et novæ civitatis Ecclesiam confabant, assumpti fuerint, nec jam amplius ex circumcisione."

“ sort adhered to the letter of the Mosaic law, rejecting all figurative interpretations: another sort admitted a figurative interpretation, conforming, however, to the letter of the precept: but a third sort (the first in Origen’s enumeration) had relinquished the observance of the literal precept, conceiving it to be of no importance in comparison of the latent figurative meaning.”*

To this Dr. Priestley replies, that in the passage in the first section Origen “ asserts, in general terms, without making any particular exception, that the Jewish Christians adhered to the customs of their ancestors,” and in the passage in the third section, “ which almost immediately follows the former, he says that his adversary, who had asserted the contrary, would have said what was more *plausible* (not what was *true*) if he had said that some of them had relinquished their ancient customs, while the rest adhered to them; alluding, perhaps, to a few who had abandoned those customs, while the great body of them had not, which is sufficiently consistent with what he had said before. For inconsiderable exceptions are not regarded in general assertions.”†

In his fifth supplemental disquisition Dr. Horsley contends, that what he had translated so as to make Origen affirm of Celsus’ fictitious Jew, that “ he might have said more plausibly,” [*ἵνα μᾶλλον πιθανώτερον εἰπῇ*] means “ that he had it to say more consistently with the character of a Jew;” i. e. “ more consistently with that knowledge of the truth, which might be expected from a Jew.” If it be thought that this new meaning is more favorable to his purpose, than what would be received from his former translation, it is still very doubtful, whether the word *πιθανώτερον*, which he had before rendered “ more plausibly,” will bear to be understood as meaning “ with more consistency of character.”

Dr. Priestley likewise remarks concerning the veracity of Origen, that the charge of falsehood is rendered extremely improbable by the excellence of Origen’s character; that even if he had been capable of falsehood, it is very unlikely, that he

* Remarks on Dr. Priestley’s Second Letters P. 2. c. 1.

† Third Letters to Dr. Horsley. Let. 1.

would assert in a public controversy, what, if not true, must from the nature of the assertion, which concerned a large body of men, have been manifestly false; and that if he had made the assertion, it is still more improbable, that he should have openly contradicted himself, not in a different work written at a different time, or in a distant part of the same work, (in which he might have forgotten what he had said in one of the passages, when writing the other,) “but in the same work, “the same part of the work, and in paragraphs so very near “each other;” and further still, that the subject concerning which he made this disputed assertion, was not one of sufficient importance in the general controversy, in which he was engaged with Celsus, to afford any temptation to falsehood.*

Dr. Horsley however brings as a further proof of Origen’s want of veracity, another passage from his First Book against Celsus. Celsus had maintained, that the Hebrew word in Isaiah vii. 14, which is rendered in the Septuagint *παρθένος*, a virgin, denotes only *νεύς*, a young woman. Origen says in reply, that the word, which in the Septuagint is here translated a virgin, “is put too, *as they say*, in Deuteronomy for a virgin—” referring to Deut. xxii. 23. 24. The word however in this passage of Deuteronomy is not the same as in Isaiah in our present copies, and was probably different likewise in those of the time of Origen. Dr. Horsley after giving the passage from Origen, proceeds—“What is this, *As they say*? Was it unknown to the compiler of the Hexapla, what the reading of the Hebrew text, in his own time, was? If he knew that it was, what he would have it thought to be; why does he seem “to assert upon hearsay only? If he knew not; why did he “not inform himself? that he might either assert, with confidence, what he had found upon enquiry to be true; or not assert what could not be maintained. EGO HUIC TESTI, “ETIAMSI JURATO, QUI TAM MANIFESTO FUMOS VENDIT, ME NON CREDITURUM ESSE “CONFIRMO”†—that is, as Dr. Horsley has before translated the passage (v. p. 255.) “I would not believe this witness “upon oath, vending, as he manifestly does, such flimsy lies.”

* Third Letters to Dr. Horsley, Let. 1.

† Remarks, P. 2; c. 1.

Dr. Priestley does not really seem to have paid sufficient attention to this argument, (which is not stated in all its parts with perfect clearness by his opponent,) to understand it; and his reply is very short and careless. If the argument be considered by others of more weight, it may be said in answer, that Origen is thought by Huetius, in his *Origeniana* Lib. II, cap. 1. § 2. to have been very imperfectly skilled in Hebrew; and that a passage parallel to the preceding is there produced by him, not from any work of controversy of Origen, but from one of those Homilies, which are supposed to have been delivered by him, after he was more than sixty years of age;* the 14th upon Numbers, § 1. The Homily is extant only in the translation of Rufinus. The passage is as follows, (Origen is speaking of the story of Balaam,) "They, who read the Hebrew, say, that in this place the name of God is not expressed in the manner in which Jehovah is written in the Hebrew, which may be examined into by him, who has the ability."† Huetius likewise produces other proofs of Origen's ignorance of the Hebrew language.

Such are the arguments, by which the veracity of Origen has been attacked; but in this controversy, it seems to have been forgotten, both on one side, and on the other, that in order to set aside the testimony of Origen, it was not sufficient to prove him, though one of the fairest characters among the Christian fathers, a wilful and premeditated liar. What is inferred from the preceding passages is asserted by him in another place, where his veracity does not come into question. In the sixteenth of his *Exegetics* upon St. Matthew, is the following passage, which has not been before quoted in this account, in which he asserts all that Dr. Priestley has inferred from the passages that have been given.

"And when you consider," says he, "the faith concerning our Saviour of those of the Jews who believe in Christ, some thinking him to be the son of Joseph and Mary, and others

* Huetii *Origeniana*, Lib. iii. c. 4. § 4.

† Aitunt ergo, qui hebraicas litteras legunt, in hoc loco Deus, non sub signo tetragrammati esse positum, de quo qui potest requirat. Orig. *Op. tom. ii. p. 322. Edit. Delarue.*

"of Mary only, and the divine Spirit, but not believing his divinity, you will understand, &c."*

This passage is from a part of Origen's exposition, where he is allegorising the story of the cure of the blind near Jericho. By the blind beggar are represented the Jewish converts, the Ebionites. The reply of Dr. Horsley therefore is as follows. "The object of the discourse is to *spiritualize* a plain story. An attempt in which the imagination of the writer is always busier than the judgment; and the style, even in allusion to historical facts, is generally rather warm than exact, and is apt to border on the vehement and the exaggerated. This is in some degree the case in this discourse of Origen's. His expressions are therefore to be interpreted by the known tenor of Ecclesiastical History: Ecclesiastical History is not to be accommodated to his expressions. That the Jewish converts were remarkably prone to the Ebionæan heresy, from which the Gentile churches in general were pure, is the most that can be concluded from this passage, strengthened as it might be with another, somewhat to the same purpose, in the commentaries upon St. John's Gospel."†

Such then, as we have seen, is the testimony of Origen concerning the faith of the Jewish Christians, and the manner in which it is answered. Such as I have before stated is the evidence from other writers for the identity of the Nazarenes with

* "Και επαι ιδης τας απο Ιουδαιων πιστευουσας εις τον Ιησουν τον υιον του πατρους ουκ εστιν ουδεις, οτι μιν η Μαριας και η Ιωσηφ διακονουν αυτων νομου, οτι μιν η Μαριας μιν μοιχε και η Δουλ πνευματος, η μιν και μετα της περι αυτου διαλογισ, εφη, &c. Comment. in Matt. Edit. Huetii, vol. i. p. 427." This passage was referred to by Dr. Priestley in his first Reply to the Monthly Reviewer, s. 1. It is there referred to as it stands in the Latin edition of Origen's works, (Dr. Priestley having then in possession no other copy of this Father), as being in the 13th of Origen's Exegetics upon St. Matthew. It is noticed by Dr. Horsley in the appendix to his Charge, who quotes the original, which according to the editions of the Greek of Origen is in the 16th of the Exegetics. It is here quoted from Dr. Priestley's Hist. Ear. Opp. B. 3. c. 8. It may be found in Delarue's Ed. of Origen, tom. iii. p. 733.

† Charge. Appendix. There is a passage in the 20th of Origen's Exegetics upon St. John (§ 26.) which is perhaps the one here referred to by Dr. Horsley, and which I believe is nowhere produced by Dr. Priestley. As it relates not merely to the belief of the Jewish Christians, but to that of Christians in general, I may perhaps notice it again in a subsequent part of this account.

the Ebionites; and such as has appeared in the controversy concerning the veracity of Origen is the success of the attempt to prove the existence of any other Jewish Christians beside those, who went under these names.*

* In the conclusion of his chapter on the identity of the Nazarenes and Ebionites in his Hist. of Ear. Opp. Dr. Priestley says—"I have not met with any mention of more than one orthodox Jewish Christian in the course of my reading; and that is one, whose name was Joseph, whom Epiphanius says he met with at Scythopolis, when all the other inhabitants of the place were Arians." This Joseph is mentioned in Epiphanius' chapter upon the heresy of the Ebionites. Jamieson in remarking upon this passage observes, that 'there is mention made of another person, a certain young man, an orthodox believer from the Hebrews in the fifth section of the same chapter.' This is true. Epiphanius, after saying that Joseph was the only true believer in the city, speaks of another, as is stated by Jamieson. Jamieson likewise thinks that there is every reason to suppose that the Patriarch Efel, mentioned in the same chapter, who embraced Christianity on his death-bed, was an orthodox believer. Epiphanius says in the same chapter, 'that he had been informed of a Hebrew translation of St. John's Gospel, and another of the Acts of the Apostles, preserved at Tiberias, by some Jewish believers, who had seen them, and who had been converted by them to Christianity.' These also Jamieson thinks were orthodox, partly because they read the Gospel of John and the Acts of the Apostles, which "it is undeniable," as he tells us, the Ebionites rejected; and partly because Epiphanius begins his account of Joseph with saying, that he was of their number. But the purpose, for which I have principally noticed Jamieson, concerns the following passage. "Epiphanius himself," says he, "was a Jewish Christian. He was not only born a Jew, but educated in that religion. In his life, said to be written by John, one of his disciples, it is asserted, that after his death one Tryphon, a Jew, took him under his care, and 'diligently taught him all things pertaining to the law and the Hebrew elements; and that Epiphanius grew in age, and in the wisdom of the Hebrews.' Dr. Priestley entertains no doubt of the orthodoxy of this Jewish Christian."

I will now give the opinion of the learned Cave concerning this life of Epiphanius, "said to be written by John, one of his disciples," as it is stated by him in his own life of Epiphanius. "His parents," says Cave, "if we may believe one, who pretends to have been a scholar and the companion of his life, were Jews," &c. Then, after mentioning some other circumstances from the same author, he says—"All which he relates at large, with infinite other particulars of his life. But I dare not treat my readers at his cost, being an author of somewhat more than suspected credit." Cave however adds, that from the learning of Epiphanius in the language and customs of the Jews, it is a probable conjecture enough, that he was born of Jewish parents.

But "since all the Jewish Christians," says Dr. Priestley, "were called Nazarenes or Ebionites, and all the writers that mention them speak of the doctrine of those sects *in general*, and not those *of their own time* in particular, as being that Christ was a mere man; the natural inference is, that those sects, or the Jewish Christians, did *in all times*, after they became so distinguished (which is allowed to have been just before, or presently after the destruction of Jerusalem) hold that doctrine. And supposing this to have been the case, is it not almost certain, that the apostles themselves must have taught it? Can it be supposed that the whole Jewish church should have abandoned the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, within so few years after the death of the apostles, if they had ever received it from them?"* . . . "To add to the dignity of their master," as he says in his History of the Corruptions, "was natural, but to take from it, and especially to degrade him from being *God*, to being *man*, must have been very unnatural. To make the Jews abandon the opinion of the divinity of Christ in the most qualified sense of the word, must at least have been as difficult as we find it to be to induce others to give up the same opinion at this day; and there can be no question of their having, for some time, believed what the apostles taught on that, as well as on other subjects."†

"The resemblance," says Dr. Priestley in another place, "between the character of the Ebionites, as given by the early Christian Fathers, and that of the Jewish Christians at the time of Paul's last journey to Jerusalem, is very striking. After he had given an account of his conduct to the more intelligent of them, they were satisfied with it; but they thought there would be great difficulty in satisfying others." Dr. Priestley then quotes the account beginning Acts. xxi. 20, as far as to v. 25; and adds, "So great a resemblance in some things, viz. their attachment to the law, and their prejudices against Paul, cannot but lead us to imagine, that they were the same in other respects also, both being equally

* First Letters to Dr. Horsley, Let. 2.

† P. 1. 1.

“ zealous observers of the law, and equally strangers to the doctrine of the divinity of Christ.”*

‘ The Nazarenes’ was, as appears from Acts xxiv. 5, and from ecclesiastical history, originally the name of the whole body of Christians. It is probable therefore, it is contended, that they, who retained this name were the genuine descendants of the first Christians, and retained with it the same sentiments, which were held by them. Dr. Horsley indeed says, that the name was never heard of in the church, that is, among Christians themselves, till it was given to a sect, who, after the banishment of the Jews from Jerusalem by Adrian, settled in the North of Galilee, and took their name from the country in which they settled. For this statement however, he produces no ancient authority; and according to Dr. Priestley, to whose assertion he made no reply, none is to be produced.

The controversy, with regard to the origin of this name, is likewise connected with one concerning the antiquity assigned to the Nazarenes and Ebionites, by those who considered them as heretics. “ You,” says Dr. Priestley in the third of his Second Letters to Dr. Horsley, “ are pleased to deny the existence of the Ebionites in the time of the apostles, contrary, I will venture to say, to the unanimous testimony of all antiquity.” To this likewise Dr. Horsley made no reply; and, considering the authorities produced by Dr. Priestley for his assertion, and that Jamieson only says in answer, that if we take these authorities of writers, who regarded the Nazarenes and Ebionites as heretics, in proof of their existence in the time of the apostles, we must likewise take the same authorities in proof that they were condemned by the apostles as is asserted by the same writers; the fact may be taken as conceded, that those who regarded them as heretics, allowed them to have existed in the time of the apostles.

I do not know, whether it be worth while to mention a notion of Dr. Horsley, which he speaks of himself as a mere supposition, though he contends, that it is highly probable, that the Ebionites, maintained some “ unintelligible exaltation of Christ’s nature,” which took place upon his ascension, so as “ to render him a proper object of worship. He makes this

* Hist. of Ear. Opp. B. 3. c. 2.

supposition to reconcile Eusebius with himself, or with another writer quoted by him, who says that Theodotus about the year 190 was the first, who taught the mere humanity of Christ, when Eusebius in his own history assigns a much higher date to the Ebionites. "According to all the accounts we have of the Ebionites," says Dr. Priestley in reply, "they were not apt to admit things *unintelligible*." Dr. Horsley does not attempt to produce any direct proof of his supposition.

With regard to the name of the Ebionites, it may be remembered that Origen considers it in one of the passages quoted from him (page 262,) as a term of reproach derived from an Hebrew word, signifying 'a beggar.' Epiphanius, it may however be recollected, speaks of an heretic of the name of Ebion, contemporary with St. John, as the founder of the sect; from whom he would of course derive their name; but in this, I believe, is regarded as worthy of very little credit. "This derivation," says Herbert Marsh, (Notes to 3 vol. of Michaelis p. 129) "was given by Epiphanius, but it does not appear, that he had any historical authority for it."

I have thus gone through with one of the most important arguments for the unitarianism of the ancient Jewish Church, and with one of the principal branches of the controversy. That part of the controversy, which I have now been stating was partly carried on between the Monthly Reviewer and Dr. Priestley. It occupies about a fourth part of Dr. Horsley's Charge and its Appendix, and the second of Dr. Priestley's First Letters in reply. It fills the sixth and seventh of Dr. Horsley's Letters, and the third and fourth of the Second Letters of Dr. Priestley. In his Remarks upon these Second Letters, Dr. Horsley, except some disconnected observations, omits all the other subjects of controversy before treated, and confines himself to the proof of Origen's want of veracity, and of the existence of a church of orthodox Jews at Jerusalem after the time of Adrian. He leaves indeed, in these Remarks, the proper subjects of the controversy, to occupy somewhat more than a third of the space which he has filled, with others which had been only incidentally introduced, such as the proof of the decline of Calvinism among the dissenters, which he had as-

serted and Dr. Priestley had denied, the repelling of what he calls a slander of Dr. Priestley, that he had spoken disrespectably of Calvinism, &c. so that, whether it be a correct impression or not, he will perhaps, to an impartial observer, have the air of a man willing to escape from the proper business of the controversy. Dr. Priestley's Third Letters are in reply to these Remarks, and of course treat of the same subjects. This part of the controversy likewise occupies two of Dr. Horsley's Supplemental Disquisitions and one of Dr. Priestley's Fourth Letters in reply. What I have enumerated amounts to more than two hundred pages, so that it will hardly be made a complaint, that I have not sufficiently condensed this account, though I trust, I have omitted no important argument. I have likewise noticed every thing, which I thought of importance in what Jamieson has added to the arguments of Horsley, whom he commonly follows. Though as he is a very diffuse writer, and has many things which seem to me mere cavils, I did not originally profess to give such an account of his work, as might supply its reading. The part of the controversy, which I have now stated, occupies about a third of his second volume, in which volume what relates to the historical argument respecting the unitarianism of the ancient church is principally contained.

(To be continued.)

[It is the following continuation of the Life of Semler the theological student, and we trust the general scholar, will find much that is valuable and interesting. There are some remarks in the free manner of the modern German school of theology, which, for ourselves, we neither defend nor approve. Ed.]

BIOGRAPHY OF J. S. SEMLER:

Translated from the original, in Eichhorn's Allgemeine Bibliothek der Biblischen Litteratur. Band. 5. Theil, 1. Leipzig, 1793.

Continued from page 73.

THE remarks of Semler, which embraced historical and dogmatical* reflections, intended to bring back his older theological

* [As those of our readers, who are not professed theologians, may not be familiar with this use of the word 'dogmatical,' we will mention, that

contemporaries from the unsupported hypothesis of a system, from exaggerated and superstitious opinions, and to secure younger theologians against them, are most richly deserving of attention. Some of them bore such a visible impress of truth, that they were evident at first sight; others were unfolded in such a pleasing point of view, that they insinuated themselves into those timid minds, which would have shrunk from them if they had been exhibited in a bold and direct manner; and others again were displayed so indefinitely and with so much ambiguity, and explained to so little advantage, that their company was by no means advantageous to the rest. Semler injured himself above all things, even in respect to his most important and best founded ideas, by the imperfect and bad manner in which he presented them. He never stopped to collect and arrange in one principal place his novel views with all their proofs, illuminated on all sides, secured against the possibility of misconception, and guarded against objections. The materials however for all this, are found scattered through the whole book; and he who imposed upon himself the severe task of collecting these dispersed materials, found himself richly enough rewarded. But he gained no admission to the indolent reader; and even to the curious and thinking he gained it with difficulty. He exposed himself and his opinions, with the lovers of every thing ancient, to opposition and the cry of heresy, and labored not sufficiently against those objections and prejudices, whence proceeded accusations of needless innovations, strange hypotheses, and groundless vagaries. He did not once strive properly to clear up his ideas and discoveries, or to exhibit them in their various favorable points of view; nor did he look through that train of great consequences, which are not manifest till one surveys with attention the whole subject.

In the year 1780 a great change took place in Semler's manner of commenting upon paraphrases; and we not only find in his dogmatical decisions, compared with the past, a difference,

it is here used in a technical sense, as very nearly synonymous with the common word 'doctrinal;' and in a similar manner the word 'dogmatist,' as an expounder of doctrines. *Ed.*]

which amounts almost to contradiction, but he branches out into prolix digressions upon public and private religion.

Besides what has been mentioned, his exegetical works are distinguished by a continual succession of historical explanations, which he first introduced, for the better understanding of the New Testament. Before this the books of the New Testament were treated as writings of our own times, as if they were penned under the influence of our opinions, and emanated from our conceptions and modes of thinking; and thoughts were elicited as the original meaning of the first century, in the same manner as if they were deduced from similar expressions of a writer of our own times. He felt that there was something wrong in this; and that it was necessary in order to derive true instruction from the scriptures to become as it were contemporaries of the authors, and to explain their meaning by the manners, and customs, and habits of thinking and speaking, peculiar to the period in which they lived. How this was to be exactly accomplished he did not immediately undertake to decide; but the fortunate bent of his genius, which conducted him to truth, discovered to him the darkness in which historical interpretation was involved. Concerning the epistle to the Romans he remarked, that the interpreters appeared to have paid too little regard to the circumstances, which the apostle had in view, and to have taken for universal dogmatical points many things, which belonged merely to the times and situation of the writer. He drew from this epistle a view of the equal ground, on which the Jews and Pagans were placed, and showed the preeminence of the new religion in comparison with the exclusive spirit of Judaism, from the equality in which it placed mankind, and from the dignity of an apostle's office among the heathen, which fell in no respect behind that of the same office among the Jews. To these things he held constantly in explaining the epistle to the Romans. But was there any thing new in this? any thing, which had been overlooked by former interpreters? None of them, who possessed any merit, had failed to remark in some degree the purpose and tendency of this epistle. But a complete historical interpretation must, in his opinion, proceed much farther. Having once removed the land marks, which were too confined, he sought to apply his principles too

universally, and extended them to places where they either gave no new light, or presented a false one.

Concerning the first epistle to the Corinthians he came upon a more fortunate track for the application of historical explanations; and here he exhibited more clearly and definitely his conceived notions respecting the manner of interpreting scripture. Many striking instances occur in this epistle, which pressed upon Semler the remark that the Christian sentiments are involved in Jewish forms of speech, which we have thought to make intelligible to Christians of our day, by transferring the meaning of Paul, as expressed in his own words, to similar expressions in our own language, founded upon our present modes of thinking. In other instances, explanations can be obtained only by the aid of history; instances, which had hitherto been little investigated and partially explained, and which no man was better calculated than Semler to examine. In the Gospel of John, he showed himself to be in full possession of the art of historical interpretation; and as well in his paraphrase, as in the annotations, which accompanied it, occur proofs of the art, by which he brought the original expressions and sentiments down to our mode of speaking and of representing our ideas. It was he, who first among our modern theologians defined and determined the original sense of the writings of the New Testament, as far as it depended on the local, temporal, and national circumstances of the authors, with constant regard to the double mode of teaching, as well in Jesus as in his disciples, and deduced results from the sources of theology towards the completion of a system, of which former dogmatists had not been in possession. He could not escape violent opposition, and the charge of a manner too bold and novel. Even Ernesti, who should have been familiar with historical interpretation from profane philology, could not yield to Semler's great ideas; and not only denied him his important support, but opposed him with every kind of sophism; as for example, in his writing upon the demoniacs of the New Testament, in which first of all he makes in the main the popular use of historical interpretation. Many liliputians sheltered themselves behind the more respectable theologians of Leipzig;

and it cost Semler a long and tedious campaign, before he gained any advantage. Fortunately he did not become weary in the cause, and sustained himself, amidst his constant defence of his sentiments, with the expectation, that a new generation would do him that justice, which the older scholars, either from a want of active research, or from obstinacy and pride, so long denied him.

From his extensive reading in the fathers, and in subsequent writers of almost every period of the church, Semler was better prepared than any other man to write a complete history of the various explanations of the Christian scriptures. He has furnished some helps for this purpose in his *antiquitates hermeneuticæ ex Tertulliano*, in his *exegetical preparations*, in his treatises upon the *dicta classica*, and elsewhere: but all this presents no whole—not even a good view of a single period. He has however abundantly explained the influence which the changes of dogmatical opinions, in different periods of the Christian church, have had upon the interpreting of the New Testament. In the apostolic times, for example, those inclined to Judaism were at war with the Gnostics, and these two sects made use of methods of explanation quite opposite in kind; after that time, the controversy concerning the divinity of Christ continued several centuries, till the Pelagian dispute taking place, interpretation received quite a new form. Whither the author tended, every theologian must have known, who was acquainted with the history of controversies. Semler knew not only that every party had embodied its private opinions with the scriptures; but he knew also what opinions and what hypotheses each party had interwoven with the explanations of the bible. But how many readers can one suppose would be benefitted by these learned views of such rare extent? To the great mass of scholars such hints were wholly useless; and one might wish, for general benefit, that Semler had shewed clearly and definitely what changes had taken place, and how they were produced; why Christians had been employed at some periods with the explanation of certain places alone, to the neglect of all others; why at others certain words or modes of expression had been taken in some particu-

lar way, through the influence of some one theologian, or of some theological school of weight and respectability, till a new controversy concerning the same words or modes of expression had introduced a new explanation; why, at certain times, particular writings of the New Testament were exclusively explained; why again, at other periods, different portions were selected, and theologians spent all their strength and skill in explanation to interpret them; why things were established by councils and books of confessions, which no one dared to reject, till they were thrown out as worthless by the church itself. Thus a history of the explanation of the scriptures, which Semler could so easily have given, would have presented the most solid ground for new critical interpretation. It would have shown for the direction of all new attempts, that the explanation of the most important writings had been determined as to its course, before it was begun; that the orthodox interpretations were always settled in the tempestuous seasons of the church; that the field had been considered fully cultivated, when it was not even broken up, nor freed from rubbish preparatory to its culture.

As Semler broke his own path in his exegetical labors, so did he also in his criticism upon the New Testament.* Even

* [The phrase, 'criticism upon the New Testament,' is here used in a technical sense, which will be explained by the following passage from Professor Marsh's ninth Lecture. "It was observed in the second Lecture, that the operations of *Criticism* and the operations of *Interpretation* are so distinct, that they ought not, however sub-divided, to be placed in the same class. But this distinction is so far from being generally observed, that many if not most English writers, use the term 'biblical criticism' in so extensive a sense as to include also *biblical interpretation*, especially when the interpretation relates to the original languages of the Bible. It is true, that no inconvenience will arise from this application of the term, if care be taken to keep *separate* the subjects, which it is thus made to *comprehend*. But though *some* writers, who use the term in this extensive sense, (for instance Dr. Gerard) have made the proper distinctions, there are *other* writers, who, in consequence of their using *one name for different things*, have treated them indiscriminately, and thence have perplexed both themselves and their readers. To prevent such confusion, I have in these Lectures invariably used the term 'biblical or sacred criticism' in its proper and confined sense, namely, as the sum and substance of that knowledge, which enables us to ascertain the genuineness of a disputed text." Ed.]

to the middle of the eighteenth century was this criticism, both in its higher and lower branches, both as it concerns words and things, a branch of learning wholly unknown to the German theologians; and when Bengel would introduce it, every one who felt his strength, stepped up in arms against him. Even Baumgarten cherished against him and his critical labors such ill-will, that he accompanied him step by step with uniform opposition. Wolf, with his false decisions in criticism, served him as armour-bearer; and he contended, to the great joy of his German contemporaries, for the infallible purity of the vulgar text of the New Testament. He accounted all the doxologies to be genuine, the passage of the three witnesses—a precious *dictum classicum*, and every change of the common reading a wilful robbery of the church.

As might be expected from the pupil of such a school, Semler had at first appeared one of its genuine disciples. Prepared like his great teacher, for exegetical and critical warfare in combating heresy, on his first appearance before the public he broke a lance with Whiston in defence of certain commonly received texts;* and, according to the then prevailing opinions in Germany, he maintained his ground to admiration. His knowledge of languages, his reading, his acuteness and activity of mind, were all in concert: but one did not perceive those tokens of a bold, unprejudiced spirit, which distinguished the future Semler. Approbation pressed upon him from all quarters; and he was praised as a young hero, from whose valour one might anticipate great conquests. But this cry of victory did not make Semler insensible to the gentleness and humanity of Whiston. This worthy old man, to whom Semler had sent his controversial writing, answered the vigorous youth in a tender and friendly manner, and excused the defects of his argument, and the author's ignorance in genuine criticism, from a want of means and opportunities to become possessed of the requisite knowledge. After he had acquired more correct views upon the subject, Semler acknowledged that the income which had been so prodigally lavished upon him, was wholly

* *Vindiciæ plurium præcipuorum lectionum codicis græci Novi Testamenti adversus G. Whistonum: Halle, 1750. 4to.*

undeserved, and atoned at the *manes* of Whiston for his youthful sins, by supporting Whiston's opinions upon more solid grounds, than that venerable man had the means of doing.

With his theological professorship at Halle he commenced his diligent and liberal study of criticism upon the New Testament, with the opportunity of lectures upon Baumgarten's *hermeneutic*, which he adapted to his own views. He was indeed better prepared for criticism than for general interpretation, from his labors upon the ancient classics, and upon the annals, chronicles, and legends of the middle ages, which had already some years before formed his talent in criticism. He fortunately took Bengel and Breitingen for his guides in special criticism upon the books of scripture, and for the history of their written and printed texts; to whom he at first wholly surrendered himself as a docile scholar: a bold and fortunate resolution, to which his native love of truth alone could determine him, since, at that time, as well at Halle, as elsewhere in Germany, their course was accounted dangerous, and every one, who proceeded in it, was thought guilty of an offence against the word of God. In the year 1759, his dissertation *de Codice Alexandrino* gave evidence of his great critical powers; and in 1760 he created an epoch in criticism upon the New Testament, for the accomplishment of which he was greatly indebted to the writings of Bengel. He pursued his course with unwearied diligence even to old age, and lived to experience, as it were, the joy of a father, in seeing his system of criticism acknowledged as the right one, by all the most able scholars. Wetstein, who had dedicated his whole life exclusively to criticism upon the New Testament, was skilled barely in the mechanical part of collecting various readings. With all his expertness in detecting single peculiarities in collated manuscripts, he never took an enlarged view of the whole; and with all his accumulated treasures, he remained an ordinary critic:* he was acquainted barely with the number, not with the weight of authorities. How differently was the mind

* [Other very respectable writers on biblical criticism have given a quite different opinion of Wetstein's merits as a critic. See particularly the notes on Michaelis, and Professor Marsh's seventh Lecture. Ed.]

of our countryman Bengel employed in criticising the New Testament! He surveyed with intense view the critical stores, which he partly collected himself, and partly found already collected; pressed deeply into the internal contents of the text of the principal manuscripts, of the readings of different versions, and of the fathers; and arranged his authorities into classes. Still the Suabian prelate was accounted of far less consequence in his native land than the remonstrant professor of the college at Amsterdam, although this last, on account of his opinions, was in bad repute; and the uncertain criticism of Wetstein was upon the point of thrusting out that of Bengel, although the latter was more certain and tenable.

In due time Semler took his side. While his contemporaries held almost exclusively to Wetstein, he returned, more perhaps from accident than choice, to the injured Bengel, and to his more solid criticisms. In opposition to Wetstein he restored particularly the honor of the manuscripts accused by him of Latinizing. It was affirmed by the critics of Wetstein's school, that their agreement with the Latin versions, was to be traced to wilful variation from the true text. But where is the evidence of this? Whence is it proved that any Latin text of the New Testament had ever been so highly respected in the east, as to lead to wilful charges of the principal manuscripts? And are not the readings, which coincide with the Latin versions, far more unlike to the Greek, than others, which pass for older? And was it ever in the heart of Greek interpolators to change a pure expression for an impure? And would not the pure Greek reading condemn interpolation? Thus we are brought to the opinion of the higher antiquity of the text, which favors the Latin, and to the very probable hypothesis, that the Latin versions proceeded from Greek manuscripts, already containing the old, assaulted readings, and that the disparaged Latin-Greek manuscripts have transmitted an ancient, valuable, and, in respect to criticism, weighty text to our times.*

* [With respect to the manuscripts accused of Latinizing, or in other words, of being corrupted from the Latin versions, and with respect to the writers in the controversy on this subject, see Michaelis, chapter viii. Section 3. and his remarks, in his accounts of the particular MSS. against

This remark lay at the ground of Semler's investigations concerning manuscripts, old translations, and the readings of the fathers. He went over the manuscripts according to the order in Wetstein, rectified and defined his frequently erroneous and indeterminate decisions; exposed to view important considerations respecting the Evangelists, which had before been overlooked; and prepared the way for a more full investigation, and a more complete description of them, by giving a more intelligible account of their peculiar and remarkable varieties of reading. By this laborious and difficult examination he was convinced of the truth of the remark, which was made by Bengel, but had since been forgotten, that the various critical authorities, which so much pains was taken to number, might be collected together under a few principal heads, by which the critical labors upon the New Testament would be very much diminished and facilitated. Thus he originated the first complete plan for the classing of manuscripts, and other critic-

which this charge has been made, with those of his commentator. In the chapter above referred to Michaelis does not mention Semler. With respect to this omission his commentator has the following note:—"Our author is here totally silent in regard to the merits of the immortal Semler, who was the first critic that ventured to call in question the opinion of Wetstein, and to defend the Codices Græco-Latini against the charge, which Wetstein had laid to them. So early as the year 1765, two years therefore before the publication of our author's second edition of this Introduction, and twenty-three before the publication of the fourth, Dr. Semler printed the third volume of his *Introduction to the Interpretation of Scripture*, entitled *Hermeneutische Vorbereitung*, in which, both in the preface, and in several parts of the work itself, he supports these manuscripts against the accusation at that time admitted by our author, and perhaps by every critic in Europe. In his *Spicilegium Observationum*, annexed to *Wetstenii Libelli ad crisin N. T.* which he published in 1766, he delivers, p. 179, 191, &c. the same sentiments; more at large, p. 44—54 of his *Apparatus ad liberalein N. T. interpretationem*, published in 1767, and lastly in the beginning of the fourth volume of his *Hermeneutische Vorbereitung*, printed in 1769. The original genius of this great critic and divine, permitted him in no case to be a blind follower of the opinion of others; he ascended constantly to the source itself, examined with his own eyes, and made more discoveries in sacred criticism, and ecclesiastical history, than the envy of his contemporaries has been willing to admit." A Latin-Greek MS. is one with the Greek text and a Latin translation. *Ed.*]

al authorities of the New Testament, and laid the foundation for the present great fabric of criticism; for what has since been done towards completing the structure, is nothing but the prosecution of the plan, which Semler commenced, and for which he collected the principal materials.*

Thus far had he proceeded in his critical investigations to the year 1768. After that time he extended his remarks to particular remains of criticism, and imparted much new light concerning them. He exposed the small critical value of the Complutensian text of the New Testament. But what was peculiarly wished of him, by which his system would have acquired general circulation, was a perfect review of the New Testament according to his fundamental rules, which his industry, after having accomplished so much of what was previously requisite, would have enabled him to complete in two years: but this wish was not realized. And in truth this undertaking was not adapted to his literary character. His mind, ever actively employed in observations peculiar and novel, did not allow him to fix upon a subject so extensive; and he would not turn to the right or to the left, so far as to deny himself in the pursuit of a new hypothesis, by engaging in what was foreign to his principal design. He was indeed capable of doing what is beyond the reach of ordinary powers. He could draw an accurate plan; he could construct the building, and erect a perfect frame; but for the filling up of the frame, for the walls and other finishing, by which the construction of it might become more solid and convenient, he had not the necessary patience and perseverance. This task he resigned to one of his scholars, who with success, and with the approbation of his contem-

* Semler's principal writings on this subject are—*Vorbereitungen zur theologischen Hermeneutik*—Preparations for theological interpretation.

J. J. Wetstenii prolegomena in Novum Testamentum cum notis et appendice. Halæ, 1764. 8vo.

J. J. Wetstenii libellii ad crisis atque interpretationem N. T. Halæ, 1766. 8vo.

[For a short account of the different families or editions of the Greek manuscripts of the N. T. see the chapter and section of Michaelis referred to in the last note; or Griesbach's Prolegomena to his edition of the N. T. sect. 3. *Ed.*]

poraries, has accomplished this subsequent labor. Criticism upon the New Testament has now a secure dwelling-house: but would this, had it not been for Semler, have been erected upon so sure and solid a foundation?

Were any one now capable of criticising with the same boldness, he might in certain particulars accomplish much, that is both new and important. Semler indeed accomplished much. Critical remarks and decisions of great weight are scattered through all his writings, particularly through his paraphrases of single books of the New Testament; and criticism upon the books explained by him has gained more from him, than from any other interpreter, although it was an incidental object. Where there were various readings, and much depended on the reading, the variations are brought to view in a manner very concise and exact, oftentimes with much greater clearness, and more perfection than by others; and what is still more, they are decided upon with masterly judgment. He has besides proposed questions in the higher order of criticism with great penetration, and generally with great success;—from the examination of which he has been enabled, barely by his nice discernment, without any peculiar helps, to sever the spurious parts of a composition from those which are genuine. What he has accomplished in the gospel of John, upon the section concerning the angel which descended into the pool of Bethesda, and that of the adulteress; upon the appendix to the epistle to the Romans, and what is annexed to the second epistle to the Corinthians, &c. far surpasses all the attempts of previous interpreters. Should those opinions of Semler, founded upon deep research, fail to approve themselves to all critical inquirers, adopted as they were by his immediate scholars, yet they would still remain striking proofs of the great critical acuteness of their author; would teach others how such investigations are connected with the higher branches of criticism; and give occasion to critics, who differ in opinion, to remove, in some other way, the difficulties which prompted Semler to exertion. In the mean time some of these higher critical discussions have become permanently established, and have stood the test of time and opposing criticism.*

* Such for example are the following writings:—

In the decision of the value of particular readings he proceeded in a peculiar way, which he opened according to his own maxims upon the subject. If he found manuscripts at variance concerning a word, or sentence, or the placing of the words, he adhered firmly to the rule, that a reading, which was a synonym of another, was spurious, and a gloss that had crept into the text from the margin; and that the shorter reading was the true one. The best proof of the soundness of this *canon* is, that in most cases it is verified or rendered probable upon other grounds, and that the reading suspected as a gloss, is really wanting in some manuscripts. He was not so fortunate in another of his favorite critical hypotheses;—that many false readings in ancient times arose from the arbitrary solution of arbitrary abbreviations, through the elders of the first Christian church. One may easily suppose that in the autographs of the sacred books, and in the oldest copies written from them, many abbreviations would be used; but there is no sufficient grounds to believe, either that these abbreviations, or the solutions of them, were arbitrary. In the use of them, as well as in their solution, there were certain definite rules. The expeditious writers, of whom the authors of the New Testament must have availed themselves, and the first transcribers, were unquestionably acquainted with this art; certainly not less acquainted, than others concerned with the Greek profane writers. For what reason should *those* have made arbitrary abbreviations, and *these* again solve them according to their pleasure? and why should the elders, who for the most part had the copies of the New Testament in keeping, bear the blame of corrupting and falsifying them? To explain the cause of the variations in so many texts of the New Testament, there is no occasion for such accusations against the ancients.

With his verbal criticism, Semler's criticism upon the New Testament, in the most extensive sense of that word, stood in close connexion. Embracing the whole contents, it appeared

Diss. quod Paulus epistolam ad Hebræos græce scripserit. 1762. 4to.

Diss. de tempore, quo epistola ad Galatas scripta fuerit. 1767. 4to.

Diss. de duplici appendice epistolæ ad Romanos. c. 15 et 16. 1767. 4to.

before the public with all the boldness and originality of its author. He investigated the several authors of the New Testament, and their individual spirit; endeavoured to ascertain the time and the genius of their writings; took a view of their design, and of the capacities of their first readers, as to their knowledge and modes of thinking, and grasped at length the scope, and direction, and use, of the whole New Testament. He collected the hitherto current representations concerning these subjects; traced their origin; examined them with a vigour and power before unknown among theologians, to ascertain whether they were groundless or well founded; destroyed the former union between falsehood and truth, and restored the latter to her empire. The greatest part of these investigations pertained to the oldest church-histories, in which he was thoroughly conversant. They proceeded upon the nicest combinations of critical and historical knowledge, and excelled in thought, originality, and boldness, and particularly in uncommon, useful, and ingenious observations—every thing that scholars of former centuries, and of the present down to his own time, had produced upon these subjects; and afforded vast assistance for the better understanding of the New Testament, and for acquiring more determinate theological opinions. A part of these investigations was perfected by their first author, or at least so nearly perfected, that it will pass to posterity with slight changes and modifications; and what has not endured the fiery trial of criticism, or may not hereafter endure it, will at least do honor to the original genius, the penetration, and the inexhaustible mental resources of the great Semler, in the view of future inquirers.

His hypothesis concerning two Christian schools extends itself through all his historico-critical investigations of the New Testament; a timid Jewish and a bold Gnostic school, into which Christians were divided from their first existence. He sought for their origin in the life of Christ, and in his custom of availing himself of a double mode of teaching, according to the different capacities of his hearers for receiving instruction, and to their greater or less degree of knowledge. With rigid Jews he was cautious, and accommodated himself to their tem-

pers; with the liberal-thinking hellenists* he used the bold Gnostic manner, the spirit of which was opposed to all Jewish prejudices, and on that account was afterwards extremely useful in the instruction of the heathen. To the first manner of teaching, the four evangelists still extant adhered, since they were destined for the instruction of Jews. In others, as in Marcion's *εὐαγγέλιον*, there were proofs of Jesus' free manner of delivering his instructions; but these proofs through the early destruction of that gospel are lost to us. In conformity to this double method of Christ's teaching, two Christian parties were formed soon after his death; one inclined to Judaism, at the head of which was Peter, together with the other apostles, who confined their labors to the Jews; the other equally inclined to the bold Gnostic school, more intellectual, with superior knowledge, (*γνῶσις*), at the head of which was Paul. Those of the last description, fully occupied with endeavours to exalt Christianity into a universal religion, looked upon every thing that appeared to stand in near connexion with Jews and Judaism, (*σὰν Χριστιανισμόν*), as unessential, and directed their efforts to the extirpation of Jewish notions from Christianity, and commended nothing but the teaching of Christ himself (*κατὰ Χριστόν*). Very different from this was the school of Peter. The disciples of this school adhered as nearly as possible to Judaism, and sought merely to remove the fanatical expectations and mean ideas concerning the Messiah. To secure the Jews against these expectations and ideas, they mixed with their instructions many accounts of the life of Jesus, recounted his origin from David, his birth at Bethlehem, and similar circumstances interesting to the Jews; shewed how the Messiah, according to the character before conceived of him by the Jews, and to the prophecies of the Old Testament explained in relation to him, really appeared in the person of Jesus, and how the places of the Old Testament applied to the Messiah, were applicable to Jesus. They consequently unfolded upon every possible occasion the connexion between the old religion and the new, often clothed their Christian sentiments in the words of the

* [Hellenists were those Jews, who, not residing in Judea, used the Greek language. *Ed.*]

Old Testament, and interwove portions of them with their discourses upon every opportunity. Since Peter and the other apostles, except Paul, labored for the most part within the limits of Palestine, this school was at first confined chiefly to Palestine; but when Barnabas separated himself from Paul's more free mode of teaching, and went over to the Jewish Christian party, this party extended itself, through the services of Barnabas, into heathen countries, and the teachers depended upon the apostles, who had their residence in Palestine.

After the death of the apostles both parties were extended, and each sought to gain advantage over the other, by means of supposititious writings. From the bosom of the party, adhering to the school of Paul, proceeded the Gnostic and allegorizing parties; and a document, which shews their mode of teaching, is still extant in the letter of Barnabas, whose author belonged to this school. Of the other party, which followed more nearly Peter's method of teaching, and was jealous of Paul, was the author of the homilies under Clement's name. Those of this party for the sake of vindicating their Jewish opinions, their fondness for fables and anecdotes concerning the earthly realm of Christ, and the circumstances attending the expected appearance of the Messiah, invented gospels and apocalypses, (as those under the names of James, Peter, and Thomas,) and, in order to allure their readers, and give their works a greater appearance of weight and value, they accompanied them with the names of apocryphal and mysterious writings.

Dissatisfied with this division among Christians, and afraid of the consequences which might result, if this open disunion in didactic discourses should continue, there were those, who in the second century thought of reconciling and uniting Peter and Paul in regard to their different methods of delivering their instructions. With this view many teachers in the church gave Peter a part in the conversion of the heathen, although they had no ground for it in authentic history. The author of the *Epistles of Ignatius* makes Ignatius declare in an earnest tone—though it is a frivolous invention—that Peter and Paul had preached Christianity at Rome in company: and Clemens of Alexandria mentions a discourse of Peter, in which Peter

himself has referred to the words of Paul—again purposely invented to produce the desired *catholic* union of the two parties. Many indeed were gained by these means; and to complete the union, the catholics, with an assumed apostolical air, undertook to brand as heretics, as well those who approached to Judaism, as those who aspired to a higher knowledge (*gnōsis*): but Tertullian, on the contrary, in his zeal against this middle way, reproaches the design of the catholic Christians, as—*corruptio legis, prophetarum, et evangelii*.

Notwithstanding all these means there did not arise a universal church, which annihilated all traces of the former double party. The Montanists still remained friends to the ancient freedom, and so resolutely separated themselves from the Jewish Christians, that they transferred the seat of the heavenly empire to Asia and Mysia, and honored *Ardaba* with the name of the *heavenly Jerusalem*.

Such are the principal threads which Semler drew from the New Testament, upon which to string the weighty facts of the most ancient church histories that are still extant. If they were, by means of hypotheses, spun out to a great length, still it was impossible to proceed without hypotheses, in connecting the disjointed materials of the history of the Christian church in the first two hundred years. The existence of two parties in the commencement of our Christian epoch is too evident to be overlooked: the contents of many supposititious writings of the most ancient period of Christianity cannot, without regard to such a state of things, be explained. There remains then in doubt only the hypothesis of the union of the two parties, and the origin of catholicism in the church. If one should regard the hypothesis of Semler as not conclusive for the explanation of the origin of the catholic party, and should think other causes to have cooperated in the production of this effect; yet it claims consideration in explaining the gradual destruction of the two-fold party.

Semler came to regard the New Testament as a collection of writings designed for the Christian parties; the gospels for the Jewish Christians, the epistles of Paul for the Gnostic Christians, and the catholic epistles for both conjointly.

All the Four gospels still extant proceed (as John says expressly of his own) upon the design of proving by means of the external history of Christ, that he was the expected Messiah; and in the next place to explain and correct the Jewish representations concerning him, and to oppose and refute the mean ideas and fanatical opinions respecting his person and character. There were gospels for Jews (*ευαγγελια της περιτομης*), to whom the outward circumstances (*σαφει*) of the founder of the new religion were in a high degree important; but no gospels for heathen Christians (*ευαγγελια της ακροβυτιας*) which Paul, who considered the teaching of Jesus alone (*πνευμα*) as important, might have wished for his scholars. The Jews, for whom these descriptions of the life of Jesus were designed, were scarcely to be found in Palestine, where the life of Jesus and his manner of teaching were known, and where one would rather have heard the history of Jesus from the mouth of the apostles, as the most credible witnesses, than have read it in writing. The gospels were in use among the churches out of Palestine, which were Jewishly inclined, and which had greatly increased since the separation of Barnabas from Paul; and thus all the diverse relations concerning the life, the actions, and the teaching of Christ, might be avoided.

Some written materials for the description of the life of Christ were in being before our gospels; and these last were more lately composed from the former.* They consisted at first of particular traditions written in the Hebrew, or Syro-Chaldaic language, which were afterwards translated into Greek for more general use, and were revised before, and during, and after the labor of rendering them into Greek, by teachers, by such as had them in possession, by translators and transcribers, enriched by additions, and in some particulars altered. From such traditions, which had gone through several hands, and, in the

* [See on this subject Herbert Marsh's dissertation on the origin and composition of our three first canonical Gospels in his translation of Michaelis vol. iii. part 2. where he has given an account of the authors, who have maintained this opinion before himself, who are Le Clerc, Michaelis, Professor Koppe of Gottingen, Semler, Lessing, Professor Niemeyer of Halle, Eichorn, and others. Professor Marsh defends, with great success, that form of this hypothesis, which he has himself adopted. *Ed.*]

several copies and translations in which they circulated, had become more or less varied and enriched in regard to the text, though they very often agreed literally, were composed soon after the destruction of Jerusalem many gospels, of which number were those of Matthew, Mark, and Luke; some of them being called by the names of the first readers, for whom they were intended, and others by the names of their original authors or compilers. One collection was called *εὐαγγέλιον κατ' Ἰησοῦν*, another *εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Ματθαίου*, a third *Εὐαγγέλιον Ματθαίου*, or *Εὐαγγέλιον Hebraicum Matthæi*, &c. But John composed his gospel as a free, independent writer, and earlier than the rest, for foreign Christians of a less timid Jewish spirit; for whose instruction it was intended, more than for a narrative of the life of Christ. He could therefore pass over many things in silence, which, to foreigners of liberal sentiments, would be more indifferent than to narrow-minded Jews. His gospel therefore, both as it regards the contents and the manner, acquired a more permanent value than the other gospels.

Amidst such a variety in their origin and their design, in the views of their authors, and the places of their appearance, it is impossible that the gospels should have met with the same approbation and ready admission among all Christians; and they were as far from being universally acknowledged by all Christian parties, as the number of genuine gospels was from being defined. Before the year 170, the four gospels now extant had no peculiar authority: Tatian first connected them together, with the omission of the genealogy; and Irenæus and Tertullian are the first who speak of four fixed gospels. A greater latitude had previously existed upon this subject. Thus Serapion allowed to the Christians in Cilicia the gospel of Peter, which had been introduced. At length there arose a society under the name of catholic Christians, which aimed to unite the two Christian parties, and to reconcile them by means of acknowledging the four gospels, concerning the use of which they had hitherto been divided; and endeavoured to produce some affinity and common interest between them.*

* Semler's *Anmerkungen zu Townson's Abhandlungen über die Evangelien*. Notes to Townson's treatises upon the Gospels.

With the same view of allaying the party-spirit of the two Christian schools, and of forming them into a single catholic church, the catholic epistles (as their name imports) were composed. Not only the adaptation of these epistles to the Christians inclined to Judaism, without the bounds of Palestine, and the late period in which they were composed, which is manifest from their frequent reference to the epistles of Paul, but also this very reference to Paul, and the occasional opposition to his favorite opinions, proved, according to Semler, their design. But since the intended coalition was not effected by these epistles, the party which kept it in view, aimed more and more to accomplish the union, and composed writings from one period to another, which ascribed all sorts of fictions to the earliest times of the planting of Christianity by means of the apostles.

The epistles of Paul were composed for the free Gnostic party, to give Christianity, by means of its entire separation from Judaism, the form of a universal religion. But the epistle to the Hebrews stood opposed to this representation of Semler concerning St. Paul's mode of teaching; for this epistle interweaves Judaism with Christianity more closely, and consequently enters more deeply into the first, than any other writing of the New Testament. Semler however was not unprepared for this objection. He did not indeed deny that this epistle was written by the apostle; but he regarded it as his first epistle, written at a time when he cherished the hope of gaining the Jews to the new religion in greater numbers—a hope, which soon after that time, he must have altogether renounced.

(*To be continued.*)

To the Editor of the General Repository & Review.

SIR,

It has given me the greatest pleasure to observe, that proposals are issued by Mr. Milliard of Cambridge for reprinting here Schleusner's Lexicon of the New Testament. It reminded me of a translation, which I had formerly made of the article ~~scopus~~ in this Lexicon for the use of a friend who did not own Schleusner; and it occurred to me, that this most

elaborate article, if presented to the public in an English dress, might not only attract the attention of students to the work, but give our theologians, who do not happen to possess it, some notion of the nature, copiousness, and value of this Lexicon of the New Testament.

Although, as far as I can judge, the high character which Marsh has given to this work in his notes on Michaelis is by no means exaggerated, yet the student must not imagine that it will supersede all other critical helps. The translating of this article has confirmed me in the belief of what I had before suspected, that Schleusner is less fortunate in casting new light on passages of difficulty, than in arranging and classing those in which theologians are generally agreed; and that excessive caution or impartiality leads him to the use of very indefinite language in many of his explications. There is also a general defect of neatness and precision in his Latin interpretations, which is no doubt in some measure to be ascribed to German prolixity, which is no where more observable than in the Latin of their commentators. This prolixity and indefiniteness I have not attempted to correct in the translation, which is very literal.

Especially, the possession of Schleusner will not supersede the use of some of the best and latest English critics. For I do not find that Schleusner quotes any English authors, except some who wrote in Latin, or whose works have been translated into Latin or German. This leads me to suspect that the Lexicographer did not understand our language; which indeed was not necessary to the making of a better Lexicon to the New Testament than had before appeared in any language.

In revising the article, which I herewith send you, I was tempted to add a few notes, sometimes by way of correction, sometimes of illustration, which you will not print however unless you please. It would have been easy to have annotated upon many more passages; but a commentary on a Lexicon seems to be literally an imposition. An Index of texts referred to their proper heads will render this communication of some use perhaps to theological students, if you can find room to insert it.

25 Feb. 1812.

SCHLEUSNER ON THE MEANINGS OF ΠΝΕΥΜΑ IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

All the significations which this many-meaning word has in the New Testament may be conveniently reduced to three classes, or genera.

I. The FIRST CLASS comprehends *physical* significations, expressing ideas of things which we can perceive and understand by the senses; and so this class includes all those passages of the New Testament where πνεῦμα is used for a *flatus* more or less strong, *balisus*, or *exhalation*. Eurip. Phœn. v. 804. ἀντὶ κατὰ πνεύματι a wind instru-

ment. Pausan. v. 25. viii. 27. ἀνέμῳ πνεύματι, that is, πνεύμῳ. Chariton. Aphrod. iii. 6. For as the word *spiritus* is derived from *spirando*, that is, from the air and breath which we draw in and throw out, (whence also the ær in which we live, and the æther which includes the ær were plainly called *spiritus* by the Latins, Plin. H. N. ii. 5, 6.) and as the very word from which רוּחַ is derived, in the Arabic and Syriac is used for breathing and exhaling of every kind, so too is πνεῦμα to be derived from πνέω *spiro*, *flo*—and signifies:

1. *A breathing, [balitus] or exhalation.* Thucyd. ii. 49. Xenoph. de Venat. vii. 3. In this signification it is found

2 Thess. ii. 8. ὃν ὁ κυριος ἀναλῶσιν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ, whom the Lord will destroy with a mere *afflatus*, or with one breath of his mouth.—There is however in these words a description of very great divine power, which is able to effect every thing by a word as it were, or by mere volition, in imitation of the Hebrew phrases בְּרוּחַ כּוּחַ Psal. xxxiii. 6 (where it is synonymous or interchangeable with the phrase בְּדִבְרֵי יְהוָה) and בְּרוּחַ יְהוָה Isai. xi. 4.

Apoc. xi. 11. πνεῦμα ζωῆς καὶ τὸ δὲν μελλόν ἐν’ αὐτοῖς, breath of life from God entered into them. This passage is to be explained of a certain divine *exhalation*, the source and cause of animal life, by a poetical fiction. Compare Genesis ii. 7. and Job xxvii. 3.

2. *The breath of the lungs, or vital and animal breath, which is drawn in and emitted through the mouth and nostrils, and of which the respiration is the cause of life.*

This signification, which רוּחַ also has in Psalm civ. 29. Job xxxiv. 14, 15. and which *spiritus* has in Cicero Verr. v. 117. and Nat. Deor. ii. 138, is abundantly confirmed by numerous passages of the New Testament, and of the apocryphal books of the Old Testament. For example—

Matth. xxvii. 50. ἀφῆκε τὸ πνεῦμα, he expired, breathed out his breath [*exhalavit spiritum*]: instead of which Mark xv. 37. and Luke xxiii. 46. more conformably to the Greek idiom, have ἐξέπνευσεν; John, however, ch. xix. 30. expresses it παρέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα.

Luke viii. 55. καὶ ἀνέστη ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτῆς, and she came to life again.

Apoc. xiii. 15. δύναι πνεῦμα τῷ μισθῷ τοῦ θανάτου. Sirach. xxxviii. 24. οὐ δύναμις πνευματικῆς αὐτοῦ. 2 Macc. vii. 22, 23. τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ ζῆλον. Consult Le Clerc Ara Critica P. ii. sect. 1. § 15. who, following the author of the Book de Mundo (who tells us, that τὸ πνέειν ἐστὶν αἵματος καὶ

ζωης και δια παντος διατεταται μενυχον δι και γνησιον υγιαν^a was anciently called πνευμα) has shown, that *spiritus* is put not only for the breath in men and animals, but also for the *vis* or *energy* on which the vigour of plants depends.

This notion of *life*, or *that state of a living creature, when it lives, moves itself, and exerts all its energy*, is a meaning, which, in a more eminent and sublime sense, πνευμα may undeniably have ex adjuncto; and this notion will, I think, contribute to remove most easily the difficulties of that passage in Hebrews, ix. 14. † ες δια πνευματος αιωνων αιωνων προσηγγισαν αμαρτιας τη θηρ κ. τ. λ. so that the words δια πνευματος αιωνων may be rendered, *through his eternal life, or his eternity*; the same thing which is expressed in chap. vii. 16. by the words αλλη θηνηται ζωης ακαταλυτου, and in v. 24. by the phrase δια το μακρον αιωνος αιωνων. — I am not ignorant, however, that Noesselt, in his Prolusio on this place, published at Halle, 1768, 4to, thinks that πνευμα is here spoken of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, inasmuch as it was absolutely complete or perfect; and that it may be said to be αιωνιος, on account of its excellence, recommending itself by its perpetuity, and effects, which are to last forever without a repetition of the sacrifice. — Suidas. πνευμα ε ψυχη ανθρωπου.

3. *Air in motion, wind*; because the natural wind, as it blows now gently, now more strong, has the greatest resemblance to the breath of the mouth, especially on account of its equally subtle material.

John iii. 8. το πνευμα ου ου διλα, πνι, the wind blows every where. ‡ By this elegant illustration, taken from the wind, which, while by its subtilty it eludes our sight, discovers its presence by its effects, Jesus endeavours to show Nicodemus, who referred every thing to the body, that there were many things really existing, which are not

^a [Substantiam animatam, et genitalem, quæ est in plantis et animalibus, et per omnia sparsa. Le Clerc.]

† [Consult Lardner's First Postscript, where much is said on this passage, and the interpretation given which Schleusner has adopted.]

‡ [Though this interpretation of πνευμα here is very generally received, it seems incredible that any writer should include in the same sentence two such different meanings of the same word, as *spirit* and *wind*, especially when the use of αιωνιος would have removed all ambiguity. It would take more time and room, than we can now afford, to discuss this subject; we will therefore only mention, that "not a single instance or authority is to be found among the fathers to countenance the modern translation, till nearly the end of the fourth century."]

perceptible by the senses, and whose nature and mode of operation cannot be discerned and described; as Grotius and Erasmus on this place have before properly observed. See too Gust. Sommel Diss. on the meaning of the word πνευμα, John iii. 8. Lund. 1774. 4to.

Hebr. i. 7. ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους ὡς πνεύματα, God makes use of the angels his ministers as winds, i. e. they execute his commands with the utmost celerity. Sirach.* xxxix. 33. 34. xliii. 18. Xenoph. de Venat. viii. § 4. Thucyd. ii. 77, and 97. κατὰ πνεύματα ἰσχύει το πνευμα. Sophocl. Ajax Flag. v. 559, and 683. Palzeph. de Incred. c. 18. αἰολός ἐστι κυριεύων τῶν πνευματων, ὅστις ἰδὼν Ὀδυσσεὺς τῆς ἀνιμῆς ἐκαστη. Jamblich. de Mysterioriis, iii. 2. Spiritus too has the same signification according to Varro de R. R. i. 57. Seneca Nat. Quæst. v. 13. and the Hebrew יָרֵךְ Jonah i. 4. Job xxi. 18. Psalm xviii. 43. —Etymolog. Mag. πνευμα σημαίνει καὶ τοὶ ἀνιμῶν ὡς το. πνευμα βίαιος. Psalm xlvii. 8.

II. The SECOND CLASS comprehends all the passages of the New Testament, in which πνευμα is used of *all simple things and substances, which are incorporeal and inconcrete, at least unincumbered with a gross body, to whatever class of things belonging*, so as at the same time to include a notion of *perfection and internal excellence*; according to an idiom of the Hebrews; who, perceiving that the animal body, whether of men or of other living creatures, was frail and mortal, when they would describe any thing *feeble, infirm, transitory, and perishable* called it בָּשָׂר (Psalm lxxviii. 39); but to יָרֵךְ they attributed a notion of *strength, continuance, perfection, and excellence*. Hence πνευμα is

4. The *anima*, or animal soul, or that essential part, as it is commonly called, by which man as well as other living creatures lives, feels, and moves. The term *animal* comes from this *anima*, which the Greek philosophers call ψυχή, and distinguish carefully from πνευμα, as the Latins, in most instances, properly distinguish between *anima* and *animus*.† See Gesner's Thesaurus Ling. Lat. under each word.—

* [This reference to Ecclesiasticus is incorrect. It probably should be to xxxix. 28—31. xliii. 13. But these passages in this apocryphal book rather favor the other translation sometimes given of this text, "who maketh winds his messengers, and flames of fire his ministers."]

† [The difference between *animus* and *anima* cannot be correctly expressed in English by the use of any two single words, or without a circumlocution. For

So πνεῦμα is used for ψυχή, as *animus* for *anima*, (consult Servius on Virgil's *Æn.* x. v. 487.) in

James ii. 26. το σῶμα χωρὶς πνεύματος νεκρὸν ἐστίν, that is, to use the words of Lucretius, "dimissâ animâ, corpus caret undique sensu," iii. 357. [When the life has departed the body has no feeling.] It was a common persuasion not only of the Gentiles, (consult the Interpreters on Virg. *Æn.* iii. 67.) but of the Jews also, that this *anima* or soul does not die, and after dissolution continues to wander about houses and sepulchres. The apostles themselves, deluded by this superstition, and not yet satisfied of the often predicted resurrection of Jesus Christ, when they at last saw him after his return to life, being struck with fear, thought they saw a spectre; ἰδοὺν πνεῦμα διακρίν as Luke says xxiv. 36. that is, a mere appearance (φαντασμα is a gloss found in some MSS.) the *anima* or ghost of the dead Jesus: and in the next verse they are told by Jesus in a popular way, that πνεύματα, or the ghosts of the dead, which are vulgarly supposed to appear sometimes to men, σάρκα καὶ οὐκ ἐκ ἑξῆς; precisely as Homer sings of the souls of the dead οὐ γὰρ οἵ τε σαρκαί τε δι' οὐρανὸν ἰστέουσιν. *Odys.* λ. 218. comp. v. 220.

In Heb. xii. 23. and 1 Pet. iii. 19. also, πνεῦμα. is used for the souls of the defunct. The τὰ ἐν φελασῇ πνεύματα in the latter place are to be understood of the souls of Noah's wicked contemporaries after leaving the body.

This notion of *anima* or spirit many interpreters have given to the Hebrew word נֶפֶשׁ in the following passages of Ecclesiastes iii. 19. 31. xii. 7. Compare also Psalm lxxviii. 39. and Athenæus *Deipnosophist.* xii. p. 530. ὅγῳ Νινὸς παλαιὸς ἐγὼ καὶ πνεῦμα quondam ego Ninus fui, spiritumque vitalem hausi.

5. *The mind, intellect, or that in us which thinks, understands, and wills, also all and each of its powers, faculties and propensities;* called by the Greeks more properly *ἡ νῦς*, to exclude, as much as possible, the notion of any thing material.

Matt. v. 3. οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι (called in Luke vi. 20. οἱ πτωχοὶ without the addition of πνεύματι) are humble men, not self-pleasers; men who, conscious of the weakness, and understanding the imperfections of their mental powers, not only arrogate nothing to themselves though the Latins as frequently confounded them, as we do our words soul, spirit, life, ghost, &c. Yet Cicero was doubtless understood when he said "sine anima anima est debilis." But no man would be, who should attempt to translate this sentence into five words of English.]

selves, but at the same time are desirous of a true knowledge of religion, and suitable improvement of mind.

Math. xvi. 41. and Mark xiv. 38. *ἡ δὲ καρὰ ἑτοίμη* your mind indeed is ready, but the weakness of human nature gives way.—For *πνεῦμα* in this place particularly signifies, the mind uncorrupted and left to itself; led by sound reason, and undepraved by the habit of regarding the body in every thing.

Mark viii. 12. *ἀποκαυχόμενος ἐν πνεύματι* sighing from the bottom of his heart.

Luke i. 80. *ἐκφραζόμενος πνεύματι* the same with *πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος* ch. ii. 52. comp. 40.

* *Iba. xiii. 46. ἃς χρεώας σε παραστήσωμαι τὸ πνεῦμα μου* to thee I now commend my soul [*animum meum*].

Acts vii. 59. *δοῦναι τὸ πνεῦμα μου* receive me to the abodes of the blessed.

John iv. 23. 24. *ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ* (instead of *ἐν πνεύματι ἀληθείᾳ*) *προσκύνησον τῷ θεῷ* to worship God with a pure mind, or with the most upright mind, *ἐν ὁλῇ τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ ἐν ὁλῇ τῇ ψυχῇ καὶ ἐν ὁλῇ τῇ δυνάμει*, comp. Matth. xii. 37.

Acts xviii. 25. *ζῶν τῷ πνεύματι* burning with the utmost desire of farther propagating the Christian doctrine. Rom. xii. 11.

Acts xix. 21. *ὁρίσας ἐν πνεύματι* he determined, had a design.

Rom. i. 9. *ὃν λατρεύω ἐν τῷ πνεύματι μου* whom with my whole soul I venerate and adore; *ἐν ψυχῇ* (Ephes. vi. 16,) with an honest mind, not for form's sake, but willingly.

Rom. viii. 16. *ἐμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν* teaches or certifies our mind.—*ibid.* 27.

1 Cor. ii. 11. 4. *ἐννοηθήσεται ὑμῶν καὶ τὸ ἡμεῖς πνεύματος* in your congregation, where I shall at least be present in mind, though absent in body. comp. 3. and Coloss. ii. 5.—1 Cor. vi. 20.†—vii. 34.

1 Cor. xvi. 18. 2 Cor vii. 13. *ἀνέπαυσται γὰρ τὸ ἡμεῖς πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ ὑμῶν* they filled your mind and mine with solace and joy.

Ibid. ii. 12. *ἐν ὁρχήᾳ ἀνέν τῷ πνεύματι μου* I was extremely anxious. Galat. vi. 18. compared with 2 Tim. iv. 22.

Ephes. vi. 18. *προσευχαλοῦμαι ἐν πνεύματι* that is *ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ* as it is in John iv. 23, 24. or *ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ* Ephes. v. 19.—Phil. iii. 5. comp. Rom. viii. 10. 1 Thess. v. 23.

* [Compare however John xix. 30. and the next text Acts vii. 59. and No. 29.]

† [See Orisbach's Greek Testament at this verse.]

The following passages, which I do not hesitate to class under this head of signification, have been thought rather ambiguous; and as they are really more obscure than the others, they deserve particular notice.

ACTS xi. 22. καὶ ἐγὼ ἑαυτῷ δοκῶ δεδεδεμένος, ἢ ἐν πνεύματι περιεσφαισμένος, ἡμετερά, i. e. I already seem to myself to be bound; or, I have a presentiment that the Jews of Jerusalem will put me in chains: so that πνεῦμα here means, the mind considered as having a power or faculty of conjecturing and anticipating what is to come.—Other interpreters however think that πνεῦμα is here put for πνεῦμα ἁγίου (comp. ag.) and is to be explained of an extraordinary divine revelation; such as Paul had through Agabus, Acts xxi. 11. and to which he afterwards refers.—Others have interpreted the whole phrase of a strong bent or impetus of mind, by which Paul was so urged that he could not persuade himself to defer or omit the journey: (so too the phrase) συνεχίζετο ἐν πνεύματι,* which is found ch. xviii. 5. and which Luther saw was to be explained of an internal emotion of the mind, (*Gründung.*)

Rom. ii. 29. περιτομή ἐν πνεύματι spiritual circumcision, belonging to the mind; or amendment of mind, inclinations, and of the whole life. Consult on this place Koppe, who confesses his doubt whether πνεῦμα here should be explained of the Holy Spirit, the author of all Christian virtue or whether, in consequence of its being opposed to ἡμέμην, which the Mosaic law is often termed, it ought not to be explained of the Christian religion itself.

Rom. viii. 10. where the sentiment το μὲν πνεῦμα ζῶν διὰ δικαιοσύνην corresponds to the clause το μὲν σῶμα περὶ δι' ἁμαρτίαν and so is to be rendered either: your mind shall hereafter enjoy the highest felicity—or, your mind is devoted to holiness and piety.

Ephes. ii. 22. κατοικοῦντες θεὸν ἐν πνεύματι a temple of God not built with hands, but spiritual and belonging to the mind; the same with κατοικοῦντες θεὸν πνευματικῶς. So the phrase οὗτος ἁγίος ἐν κυρίῳ put for οὗτος ἁγίος ἐν κυρίῳ, or οὗτος κυρίου, signifies a temple sacred to God.

1 Thess. v. 23. πνεῦμα καὶ ψυχὴ are joined together, as we say in common parlance, *heart and soul, mind and spirit*, (*Herz und Sinn, Geist und Seele,*) and among the Hebrews אֵל and נַפְשׁ, Deut. vi. 7. and the Latin *mens* and *animus* are often found conjoined. Consult Wetstein N. T. T. ii. p. 308.—This observation applies also to

* [*Grisebach's text is ἐν λόγῳ.*]

Heb. iv. 12. where the divine threatenings, which are most sure and efficacious, are said to penetrate *αχρι μεμεσση ψυχης τε καὶ σωματος*, i. e. even to the soul, so as to divide it, as it were; and affect the mind with the most acute pain, and utmost terror.

Hebr. xii. 9. God is called *ὁ πατήρ τῶν πνευματικῶν* i. e. *πατήρ πνευματικῶν* spiritual father, God, to whom we are indebted not only for the body, but for the mind, and for the Christian religion with all the benefits accompanying its profession and practice. Theodoret on this place says well, *πατήρ τῶν πνευματικῶν τῶν πνευματικῶν πνεύματι κληθεὶς ὡς τῶν σωματικῶν χαρισμάτων πηγή.*

1 Pet. iv. 6. *πνευματι* for *κατὰ τὸ πνεῦμα*, as to the immortal mind: for it is opposed to *τῇ σαρκί*. Comp. iii. 18. [See no. 10.] and Matth. x. 28.

Hither may be referred also the phrase *ἐν πνεύματι* in Apoc. i. 10. (*ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι*, the same with *ἐκστασὶς ἐν' αὐτῇ ἐκστασει*, Acts x. 10.) iv. 2. xvii. 3. xxi. 10. in which places the writer speaks of a prophetic ecstasy, or vision, which sometimes happened to the apostles.—Nevertheless, it remains doubtful, whether in these passages *πνεῦμα* is the mind itself, called away from the body, and fixed in thought and contemplation of divine things; or that divine influence, by which the person is warned and directed to attend to the subject to be revealed; or, finally, the vision itself, which takes place in the mind of him who is carried away by the spirit of God.—Equally ambiguous is the phrase *ἐν τῷ πνεύματι*, which occurs in nearly the same sense Ezek. xi. 24. xxvii. 1.

6. In particular, and by a metonymy of the cause *πνεῦμα* signifies the feelings of the mind in a rather extended sense, including our words *sentiment, views, feelings, way of thinking* (Gesinnungen, Empfindungen, Gefühle, Denkungsart). Sophocl. Œdip. Colon. v. 640. *καὶ πνεῦμα τ' αὐτοῖς ἔστω καὶ ὡς ἀνδρασι φίλοις βίβεται, ὡς πρὸς πόλιν πολιν.*

Luke ix. 55. *οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι πνεύματος ἐστὶ;*† know ye not what ought to be your feelings?

Acts ii. 4. The apostles are said to have spoken in foreign languages, *κατὰ τὸ πνεῦμα ἰδὼν αὐτοὺς ἀποφθεγγόμεναι*, which words are

* [In Bruck's edition it is v. 612. "Neither do friends always have the same feelings toward one another, nor city toward city." We find the Latin word *aure* used in the same way; as in Horace "*Nec sumit apt poqit secures ar-*" *hiclo popularis aure.*"]

† [This is Griesbach's reading, with an interrogation. But the whole clause is of very doubtful authority, see Griesb.]

commonly rendered: as the holy spirit gave them utterance. But it would rather interpret πνεῦμα *of the fulness of the heart, or inner feelings of the soul*, for two reasons; partly because it is not πνεῦμα ἁγίου in the Greek, but simply πνεῦμα; and partly on account of the frigid tautology of the common explication.

Rom. viii. 15. πνεῦμα δουλείας, such feelings as slaves have, who fear their masters rather than love them. Under the old Mosaic dispensation, this was particularly true of the Jews; but, under the Christian dispensation, this disposition has given place to πνεύματι τῆς ἀδοκίας, to the feelings of ingenuous sons, who expect from their parents, whom they obey with alacrity, every thing good; and these, Christians resemble in their obedience out of sincere love towards God, and in the supreme confidence which they repose in God. Ibid. ver. 16. and this sense, worthy of the sons of God, or of Christians, certifies or assures our mind that we are indeed the sons of God.

1 Cor. iv. 21. ἢ πνεύματι πραΰτητος, so that I may exercise mild and gentle feelings. Comp. Galat. vi. 1.

1 Cor. vi. 17. ἡ πνεῦμα ἑστίν is animated as Christ was, or expresses his sentiments.

Ibid. xii. 13. ὡς ἡ πνεῦμα, the same as ὡς ἕσται τοῦ πνεύματος, Ephes. iv. 3. comp. 4. (where the Syriac version deserves to be consulted,) or ὡς τῆς κοίτης τοῦ πνεύματος Philip. ii. 1. comp. i. 27. i. e. so that there should be the utmost union of minds, or mutual agreement.

2 Cor. iv. 13. ἔχοντες διὰ τοῦτο πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως, since we have the same sentiment of trust, or confidence.

Galat. iv. 6. ἐκπεπαιγμένος ὁ θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ διὰ αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ἡμῶν, has given us the same disposition which was in his son. comp. Rom. viii. 15.

2 Tim. i. 7. ὃ γὰρ θέλει ἰδοὺ ὁ θεὸς πνεῦμα δουλείας ἀλλὰ δυναμὸς καὶ ἀγαπῆς καὶ εὐφροσύνης, it is God's will, that the teachers of the Christian religion execute the office committed to them, not timidly and hesitatingly, but fearlessly, courteously, kindly, and prudently. Ezek. xi. 19. πνεῦμα καὶ οὐκ ἔσται αὐτοῖς. Suidas. πνεῦμα δυνάμει αὐτοῖς, πνεῦμα καὶ οὐκ. ὃ τὸ πνεύματι λόγῳ, ἀλλὰ τὸ λόγῳ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν.

7. It is applied in general to *intelligent, simple, indissoluble natures, not objects of the senses, and much superior to human minds*, such as, among us, come under the name of *spirits*, κατ' ἐξοχὴν.

John iv. 24. πνεῦμα ὁ θεός, God is a spirit; that is, he has the pow-

er and attributes of a spirit in an eminent degree; not only is he free from every thing material, every thing like concretion and dissolution, but he is invisible also, and omnipresent.

1 Cor. xv. 45. *ὁ ἀρχαίος ἀδάμ ὡς πνεῦμα ζωνοῦν*. If *ὁ ἀρχαίος*, from the preceding clause, is to be repeated before these words, (which has been the common opinion) then *πνεῦμα* will signify the immortal body, which, by divine power, Christ received after his return to life, when all human weakness was removed.—But if, from the whole tenor of the passage, *ὁ ἀρχαίος* is to be understood here, then *πνεῦμα* necessarily signifies Christ's divine nature, which he had before the world was, and which is here called *πνεῦμα* on account of the power and properties of an uncreated and divine spirit, with which Christ was from all eternity distinguished.—Heb. i. 14.

8. In particular: *good and bad angels*, called *πνεύματα* on account of the incorporeal nature, and the perfection with which they are endowed. Etym. Mag. *πνεῦμα καὶ ὁ ἀγγέλως*.

Apoc. i. 4. where by *τα ἑπτὰ πνεύματα* Drusus rightly says, we must understand seven angels, or archangels, who were feigned by the Hebrew poets to stand as guards before the throne of God, and attend upon him. Comp. Tobit. xii. 15. and Apoc. xviii. 2. The following passages in the Apocalypse I also interpret of good angels, God's ministers. Apoc. iii. 1. iv. 5. and v. 6.

More numerous are the places in the New Testament where *the spirits who fell from their integrity into wickedness* are signified, sometimes by the word *πνεύματα* simply, and sometimes as *πνεύματα ἀκαθάρτα* (that is, *δαίμονα*. Matth. x. i. comp. Luke ix. 1.) and *πονηρὰ*, Luke xiii. 29. Ephes. vi. 12.

Mark iii. 30. *πνεῦμα ἀκαθάρτων ἔχει*, he performs miracles by the help of Satan.

Luke xiii. 11. *πνεῦμα ὀφθαλμῶν*, a disease produced by a *dæmon*; and called by the Greeks *νεφθαλμία*, and by Hippocrates *οφθαλμία*.

Acts xvi. 16. *ἡ γυναὶς πνεῦμα πωλοῦσας*, a woman who told fortunes, gifted with a fortunetelling *dæmon*.

It was a common opinion and sentiment among the Jews, especially after the Babylonish captivity, not only to ascribe to Satan and his supposed subjects an influence over the minds of men, and the origin of errors and crimes; but they also thought that these *dæmons* (of whom, in their opinion, the whole universe, and especially the air, was full; and by whom its several parts were moved and governed) frequently exercised a power over the bodies of men, and

were the authors of such diseases as were either inextinguishable or very severe. To this opinion of the Jews about the power of demons over the whole human constitution, (concerning which see Doederlein, *Institutio Theologi Christiani*, Lib. i. c. 2. Esc. i.) we owe it that

9. By metonymy, not only the diseases themselves which were said to be produced by demons, (consult Lightfoot *Hor. Hebr. and Talmud*, p. 827.) but also, by enallage, the persons possessed and tormented by the demon, often in the New Testament come under the name of *πνευμα*.—Of the first kind are these passages

Matth. viii. 16. καὶ ἐξῆλθε πνευμα λόγῳ, and with a word he healed demoniacs. Matth. xii. 43, 45. and Luke xii. 24—26. Indeed the Jews, observing that the disease sometimes returned unexpectedly with new force and repeated attacks, either imagined, or so expressed the thing, as if the demon had returned to his country, or to desert places, and when he could find no dwelling place, came back, after taking with him seven or many other demons, and again afflicted the man when secure, and thinking of no such thing.

Mark i. 23. ἀνθρώπος ὁ πνευμα ἀκαθάρτου comp. Luke iv. 33. ἀνθρώπος ἔχει πνευμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου where two readings seem to have coalesced into one.—Mark i. 26. 27. v. 2. (comp. Matth. viii. 28. and Luke viii. 27.) and 8. (comp. Luke viii. 29.) vi. 7. vii. 25.

Mark ix. 17. 25. ἔχοντι πνευμα ἀλλοῖον afflicted with a disease produced by a demon, which had deprived him of all power of speaking.—Luke vi. 18. vii. 21. viii. 2. ix. 39. comp. 42. x. 20. Acts v. 16. viii. 7. xix. 12, 13.

Now, so strong was the persuasion among the Jews of the power of Satan on human bodies, that the delirious speeches and actions of those who were seized with violent disorders, raving madness especially, were attributed to the possessing demon; so also the persons who were affected with these disorders seem to have labored under the same morbid delusions, and to have thought themselves really sustaining the character of the demon. (Consult Luke viii. 27—31.) Hence it is that even in the New Testament the *πνευμα ἀκαθάρτου* and *πνευμα* is sometimes mentioned, where nevertheless we must properly understand by it, the person himself who was supposed to be possessed by a demon.—Mark iii. 11. where the Syriac translator has well rendered the words *τα πνευματὰ ἀκαθάρτα* those who had plagues of unclean spirits.—Acts. xvi. 18. xix. 15. comp. 16.

10. *πνευμα* and *πνευμα ἄγιον* in the books of the New Testament

are often used of *God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*, so as not only to signify the invisible and incorporeal nature, but also the divine majesty itself common to these three. For the word $\pi\upsilon\mu\alpha$ among the Hebrews is applied to every thing which possesses the utmost perfection, and which has something august and magnificent, and which strikes the mind with amazement, and with the highest reverence; as we are told by Ernesti in his *Opuscula Philol. and Crit.* p. 247. after quoting Isai. lxi. 3.

Acts i. 16. $\epsilon\delta\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\theta\eta\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\eta\iota\ \gamma\gamma\omicron\gamma\alpha\phi\eta\ \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\alpha\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\omicron\ \rho\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\alpha\delta\epsilon\delta\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \lambda\omicron\iota\varsigma$. Here $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is to be explained of God the Father; as all those passages most clearly evince, where the prophets, describing their divine mission, not only confess that they wrote, did, and taught only what they were commanded and had received from God, (for example Jerem. i. 7—9. Amos iii. 7.) but they also often use the phrases $\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{m}\ \mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{m}\ \mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{m}\ \mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{m}$, $\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{m}\ \mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{m}\ \mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{m}$, and $\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{m}\ \mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{m}\ \mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{m}\ \mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{m}$ in such a manner, that, when in the New Testament they are said to have spoken or written $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$, or $\phi\iota\lambda\omicron\sigma\phi\iota\alpha\iota\ \delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\omicron\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$, it cannot be otherwise understood, than that God had spoken by them. (Acts iii. 21. iv. 25. compared with 24. Hebr. i. 1.) The same thing is clearly intimated by the word $\delta\omega\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ 2 Tim. iii. 16.—Since, however, we are taught in the sacred writings, that to the Holy Spirit is to be ascribed a participation of divinity and of all its attributes, it is apparent that my explanation does not absolutely exclude the person of the Holy Spirit from this passage. The same thing is true of the passages which follow.

Acts xxviii. 25. Ibid. xv. 28. God, who is wont to instruct his apostles concerning his will in doubtful cases, and to direct their minds in ordering the affairs of the Christian church, is called $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$.

Rom. ix. 1. $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ by God, to whom all things are open. For this is a form of an oath, as Noesselt and Koppe have properly observed, and these words $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ are to be connected with $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \psi\epsilon\upsilon\delta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$.

1 Cor. ii. 13. $\delta\iota\delta\alpha\tau\omicron\iota\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ scil. $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\iota$ mode of delivering the Christian religion, taught and commended to the apostles by God himself.

Eph. vi. 17. $\mu\alpha\chi\iota\rho\alpha\ \tau\omicron\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ sword with which God furnishes men; put for $\acute{\alpha}\ \mu\alpha\chi\iota\rho\alpha\ \tau\omicron\ \delta\epsilon\upsilon$, in the same sense with $\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\pi\lambda\omicron\varsigma$

9m, ver. 11. Others interpret it of the sword in a spiritual sense, *ἡ μαχαίρη πνευματικῆς*, with nearly the same meaning.

Hebr. iii. 7, ix. 8. *τοῦτο θέλωντες τὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου*, God, the author of the whole Mosaic economy, signifying this. *ibid.* x. 15.

1 Pet. i. 2. *ἡ ἁγιασμὸν πνεύματος*. Most interpreters are of opinion that these words should be referred by trajection to *ἐκλελυτός*, which went before ver. 1. and therefore interpret *πνεῦμα* of the divine power, to which, according to the apostles' constant doctrine, is not only owing the first knowledge of Christianity, but to which is also to be ascribed every thing which a Christian does well, wisely, and happily; or to which Christians are indebted for *τοῖς ἁγιασμοῖς*.—Not less probable however is the opinion of those, who, including the words *κατὰ προφητείαν* — *Χριστῷ* in a parenthesis, and connecting them with the words *Πατέρες ἀποστόλοις Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ* in the first verse, interpret *ἁγιασμοῖς πνεύματος* of God himself, who had separated Peter, as it were, from the rest of the disciples of Christ, and had committed to him the office of an apostle.—Etym. Mag. *πνεῦμα* : 3m.

As we find *πνεῦμα* sometimes used in the New Testament for God, whom we worship as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, so it has, for a like reason, been the opinion of some interpreters, that it is sometimes used for Jesus Christ the son of God. Hither I refer 1 Tim. iv. 1. where the words *πνεῦμα ἡμῶν λόγος*, I understand of the predictions of Christ, which we read in Matth. xxiv. 11. 24. Mark xiii. 22. for no passage is to be found in the Old Testament which can with any probability be referred to here. Apoc. ii. 7. (comp. i. 1, 13, 17, 18. ii. 1.) 11. (comp. ver. 8.) 17, 29. iii. 6, 22, 23. xiv. 13. xxii. 17.

I have not found a single passage, (if you except 1 Cor. xv. 45. where the writer is speaking rather of the spirituality, than of the divine majesty, [of Christ]) from which it can be satisfactorily shown that *πνεῦμα* even in the New Testament signifies Christ's divine nature. See Frommanni Disquis. whether the word *πνεῦμα* in the New Testament sometimes signifies the divine nature of Christ? in his Opuseula Philol. p. 254.

Rom. i. 25. and 1 Pet. iii. 18. Nothing hinders our understanding by *πνεῦμα ἁγιασμοῦ* and *πνεῦμα* the divine omnipotence, or the divine power which was in Christ, and by which he was raised from the dead.—We shall show presently that the same word in 1 Tim. iii. 16. is to be explained of the miraculous power with which Jesus was endowed.—We have already seen that the meaning in question

is very foreign from the phrase *πνευμα αγιον*, Hebr. ix. 14.—It appears however from passages collected (by Albert zum Felde in *Decade Obs. Sacr. e Patribus Apostolicis*, Obs. iii.) from Clement, Ignatius, and Barnabas, that Jesus was very frequently called *πνευμα -sanctus*, the Holy Spirit.

Especially, is *πνευμα* and *πνευμα αγιον* used to denote that third *subjectum*,* which, besides the Father and the Son, exists in God, and is by us called *πνευμα θεου*, the Spirit of God, or the Holy Spirit. And although it can by no means be altogether denied, that, through the various use of the word, many passages in the New Testament where mention is made of the Holy Spirit, always have something of ambiguity, and are not to be too much multiplied to prove the Holy Spirit to be different from the Father and the Son, (for there is no doubt, that with the words *πνευμα αγιον* is to be associated a notion of divinity,) yet in many unequivocal passages of the New Testament we are taught by the lessons of Christ and his apostles, that the Holy Spirit is to be regarded in the same rank with the Father and the Son, and with both to be religiously worshipped by men. And since the sacred writers, when making mention of the Holy Spirit, seem to have done it, not so much to teach the internal relation of the Holy Spirit to the Father and the Son, and to present to the mind notions too subtle and complex, and entirely unsuited to the apprehension of their readers, as to recount the many and signal benefits which men impute to the Holy Spirit, and to declare clearly what Christians may at any time expect from the same; all the passages which will be quoted below for *πνευμα* are to be explained of the influence of the divine Spirit exerting itself in various ways in the minds of men, and of its benefits in general, and in the opinion of most are to be referred to that class of passages which, when the word *πνευμα* is used of the Holy Spirit, exclude all thought of a mere faculty, or divine power.†—A very observable

* [Somewhat?].

† [The obscurity of this important passage is not entirely the fault of the translator. If there be no typographical error in the original, it would seem that Schleusner was willing to be "rather obscure" himself. The passage in the original is as follows, and in order to be understood, must be mended either in syntax or punctuation. "Et quia Scriptores sacri, Spiritus Sancti mentionem injicientes, "consulto videntur hoc egisse, ut non tam, quæ sit Spiritus Sancti interior relatio ad Patrem et Filium, docerent, et notiones nimis subtiles ac compositas lectorum, quæ captui minime accommodatas menti obicereant, quam potius multa illa et

passage, from which alone it is made out that the Holy Spirit differs from the Father and the Son in the same sense that they differ from one another, is that in Matth. xxviii. 19. where the apostles are commanded by Christ to baptize, *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος* in the same way as into the name of the Father and Son.* Consult Zachariæ Diss. Theol. de Formula Baptismali. Gött. 1766.—With no less clearness and evidence are quoted also the passages concerning the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, sent from the Father and coming in the place of Jesus, promised to the apostles by Jesus, John xiv. 17, 26. xv. 26. xvi. 13. and described as different from *πατήρ* and *υἱός* by Paul 1 Cor. xii. 3, 4—6.

III. The THIRD CLASS of significations, which is very extensive, includes the passages in which the word *πνεῦμα*, either alone or with the addition of the words *θεός* and *ἅγιος*, is used for the several operations and gifts, which are commonly attributed in the New Testament to God and the Holy Spirit, and so denotes every thing which is divine, in the Latin sense of the word; that is, most excellent and eminent, which belongs to God, and is owing to his favor.†

John vi. 63. *τὰ ῥήματα, ἃ ἐγὼ λαλῶ ὑμῖν, πνεῦμα ἐστὶν* my doctrine, which I deliver to you, is divine; that is, proceeds from God and

“ insignia beneficia commemorarent, quæ homines Spiritui Sancto referunt accepta
 “ et quid ab eo quovis tempore Christiani expectare possint, perspicue traderent,
 “ omnia etiam, quæ infra commemorabuntur loca, ubi πνεῦμα de vi Spiritus divini,
 “ variis modis in hominum animis se exerente, ejusque beneficiis univære expli-
 “ canda sunt, ex plerorumque sententia ad classem locorum N. T. referenda sunt,
 “ quæ in voce πνεῦμα, de Sp. S. adhibita, omnem mæris facultatis, vel virtutis di-
 “ vine cogitationem excludunt.”]

* [If the former sentence be obscure, this is ambiguous. For it may mean that the passage in Matth. xxviii. 19. is the *only one* from which the distinction in question is made out; or that *this passage alone* is sufficient to prove the distinction. And that the passages referred to in John and Corinthians are as clear as this. We have been careful to preserve the ambiguity of the original. “ Illustre autem præ cæteris dictum, e quo solo efficitur, Spiritum Sanctum eodem sensu a Patre et Filio differre, uti illi ipsi inter se differunt, est, quod apud Matthæum xxviii. 19. legitur. &c.”]

† [The language in which the author defines this Third Class of significations is so general, as to allow a very great latitude and choice of meanings in the texts which he has afterwards explained under the remaining thirteen heads.]

transcends human capacity, and so, to know it God's assistance is needful.

Galat. iv. 29. ὁ κατὰ πνεῦμα γινώσκας, the son produced by the divine power itself, is opposed to τὸ κατὰ σάρκα γινώσκοντι, the son begotten by natural vigour. In particular

11. *The divine influence, by the intervention of which Jesus not only began to live, but was also at his baptism inaugurated to his public office, and distinguished by testimonials of the highest dignity in the vision which John had.*

Matth. i. 18. ἰσχυρὰ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου, she was found pregnant by the Holy Spirit.

Ibid. 20. το γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ γινώσκον ἐκ πνεύματος ὡςτις ἁγίου, for what she has conceived is of the Holy Spirit.

Luke i. 35. πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπιτεουσιναι ἐπὶ σε καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σε, the Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and divine power shall overshadow thee; in which words it is openly declared that Jesus derived his origin from the intervention of divine power, or by miracle. For the Holy Spirit is said to *come upon men*, in whom it effects greater things, than what could either be expected from the common energy of nature, or be produced by an increase of its energy. comp. Judges xv. 14. and 1 Sam. xi. 6. and Doederlein Institut. Theol. Lib. ii. P. ii. § 232.

Matth. iii. 16. καὶ οἶδε τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ καταβαίνειν ὡςτις περιστερῶν, καὶ ἐρχομένων ἐκ' αὐτοῦ. Mark i. 10. Luke iii. 22. John i. 32. 33.

12. *The divine power, by the aid of which Christ wrought his miracles on earth, and completely executed the business committed to him by God.*

Matth. xii. 28. ἐὰν δι' ἐγὼ ἐν πνεύματι Θεοῦ ἐβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, if I by divine aid cast out demons; the same with Luke xi. 20. ἐὰν δι' ἐγὼ δυνάμει Θεοῦ ἐβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια.

Ibid. 31, ὁ δὲ τὸ πνεῦματος βλασφημία, scoffs at the divine power by the aid of which Christ wrought miracles on earth; uttered by the Pharisees, who accused Christ of working his miracles by the assistance of Satan; which scoffs are hinted at in this phrase, 32. οἱ πᾶσι λεγούσι κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγίου. Mark iii. 29. comp. with 30.

Luke iv. 1. ἰσχυρὸς δὲ πνεύματος ἁγίου πληρὸς but Jesus, endowed with those gifts, and signal powers with which he was furnished by God at his baptism (iii. 22.)

Ibid. 14. ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος, so that the divine power exerted itself in him, with which he was furnished at the time of his baptism.—Luke xii. 10.

Acts i. 2. *δυνάμει πνεύματος ἁγίου*, through the divine power which was in him, furnished with which he gave orders to his apostles about the right performance of their office. Comp. Matth. xxviii. 18. and seq. and Acts x. 38, *ὡς ἐχρίσεν αὐτὸν ὁ Θεὸς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ δυνάμει*.

1 Tim. iii. 16. *ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι*, was declared the Messiah by that divine power, with which he was furnished to perform miracles.

1 John v. 6. *καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἰσχυρὸν ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα ἰσχυρὸν ἢ ἀληθείας*, and the power which was in Jesus of working miracles testifies, that the religion taught by him is truly divine, and therefore entirely worthy of credit. Ibid. 8.

13. *All the remarkable virtues and faculties of mind, granted men by God or the Holy Spirit.*

Luke i. 15. *καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου πλησθήσεται ὅτι ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ*, who, even from his mother's womb, shall be furnished with eminent gifts of the Holy Spirit. This is spoken of John the Baptist, and of the distinguished faculties with which he had been furnished by God for the right execution of the duties of his office of preparing the minds of men for the advent of the Messiah, and instructing them concerning the future reign of the Messiah.

Ibid. 17. *ἐν πνεύματι καὶ δυνάμει ἰσχυρῷ*, for *ἐν ἀποδείξει πνεύματος καὶ δυνάμεως ἰσχυρῷ*, so that the same endowments and powers of mind should exert themselves in him, with which Elias had been furnished. For *δυνάμει* cannot be conveniently explained of the power of working miracles, and therefore is to be understood either of the virtues of the mind, or of the force of speech or address.

Acts vi. 3. *ἀνδρας πλῆρεις πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ σοφίας* men endowed with singular prudence and wisdom. For, the difference between *πνεῦμα ἁγίου* and *σοφία* here I take to be this: that the former signifies prudence and skill in the good management of affairs, or the correct administration of offices; which in Exodus xxxv. 31. is also called *עֲלִיזָבֶדֶת*; the latter signifies an intimate knowledge of the Christian religion. Ib. 5. *πνεῦμα ἁγίου* in the same sense is distinguished from *πίστις*, that is, *good faith, probity*. Ibid. ver. 10. and xi. 24.—Add Sirach. xlviii. 13.*

* [In the *twelfth* verse of this chapter of Ecclesiasticus it is said, "Elias it was who was covered with a whirlwind; and Eliseus (i. e. Elisha) was filled with his spirit: whilst he lived he was not moved with the presence of any prince, neither could any bring him into subjection." This reference it would seem ought to have been placed after the preceding passage Luke i. 17. which is strong-

We find it used for the divine powers and faculties by the aid of which any one is able to execute rightly an office committed to him by God: as in .

Matth. xii. 18. *Δεσν το πνευμα μου εν' αυτου* compared with Isai. xlii. 1.

John iii. 34. *α γαρ εκ μετρου διδωται ο θς το πνευμα* for God hath abundantly furnished him with the powers and faculties necessary to the right discharge of the office committed to him.

Hence it is particularly and *κατ' εχρησιν* used concerning the divine powers and abilities with which the apostles were furnished, rightly to deliver and maintain the religion of Christ; and were qualified not only with the utmost tranquillity, constancy, and freedom of mind, but also with a wisdom and energy of speech openly to defend the grounds of the Christian doctrine and of their own conduct before emperors, kings, procurators, and magistrates, and to preserve, when in the most imminent peril of life, a good hope, and a strong and imperturbable mind.

Matth. x. 20. *το πνευμα το πατρος υμων (ετι) το λαλουν εν υμιν*, the Holy Spirit will speak by you, or suggest to you at the time what and how ye shall speak; that is, when ye are brought before princes and kings on my account, as had been said 18.

Luke xii. 12. *το γαρ πνευμα αγιον διδαξει υμας εν αση τη ωρα η δεσιν αυτων*. Mark xiii. 11. comp. Luke xxi. 15.

Acts iv. 8. *τοτι Πιτρος πληρης πνευματος αγιου επει προς αυτου*; then Peter with the utmost freedom of spirit thus addressed them. Ib. v. 31. *επληθησαν απαντες πνευματος αγιου και ελαλουν τον λογον του θς μετρε παρεργειας*.

1 Cor. ii. 4. *εν αποδοξην πνευματος και δυναμει* so that I showed myself sufficiently furnished with divine gifts for the right delivery and defence of the Christian religion.

Ibid. vii. 40. *δενω δε καγω πνευμα θς εχων* for I am endowed with divine powers, and therefore what I advise is worthy of approbation.*

ly related to this place in Ecclesiasticus xlviii. 1—16. Few persons are aware of the great number of passages in the New Testament similar to others in the Apocryphal books.]

* [Schleusner evidently supposes *δενω* here to be used in the sense of the Latin *scire, cognitum* and *perseptum habeo*. He translates this passage in another place *videtur autem et ego vobis divinitus esse inspiratus*; expressing assurance rather than any degree of doubt.]

2 Tim. i. 14. τὴν καλὴν παραθήκην φυλάξαι διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου, τοῦ κατοικοῦντος ἐν ἡμῖν. 1 Pet. i. 12.

14. *The extraordinary gifts, as they are commonly called, of the Holy Spirit, which fell to the apostles on the day of Pentecost after Christ's ascension, and with which many Christians, and almost all the teachers of the Christian religion in the primitive church, were furnished: for instance, the gift of speaking in foreign languages, of working miracles, of speaking by divine afflatus, &c.*

John vii. 39. τότε δὲ οὐκ ἦν πνεῦμα ἁγίον, ὅτι οἱ ἀκούοντες οὐκ ᾔδεισαν, but these things he meant of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, which his true followers were to receive; for those extraordinary gifts were not yet in existence, because Jesus had not yet ascended into heaven.

Acts i. 5. ὑμεῖς δὲ βαπτισθήσεσθαι ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ ὕδατι πολλὰς τῶν ἡμερῶν. Ibid. 8. ἀλλὰ λαβήσεθι δυνάμιν ἐπιλόδοις τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐφ' ὑμᾶς. Ibid. ii. 4. 17. 18. 33. v. 32. viii. 15. 17. 18. 19. ix. 17. x. 44. 45. 47. xi. 15. 16. xiii. 9. where πνεῦμα ἁγίου is to be particularly understood of the power and authority granted to the apostles of punishing upon the spot, and affecting with the severest diseases, and even with death, refractory and impious men. comp. ver. 11.—Ibid. xv. 8.

Ibid. xix. 2. ἀλλ' οὐκ οἶδ' ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ ὅτιν ἡμεῖς ἔχουσιν we have not even heard what these extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit are.

Ibid. 6. ἡλθε τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἁγίου ἐπ' αὐτούς, ἐλάλην τε γλῶσσας καὶ προφῆταιον.—1 Cor. xii. 7. xiv. 12. 2 Cor. vi. 6.

2 Cor. xi. 4. καὶ πνεῦμα ἵκεν λαμβάνετε, ὃ καὶ ἐλάβετε if any one offer you new gifts of the Holy Spirit, such as ye have not before received.—Hebr. ii. 4. Apoc. xix. 10. where see the commentators.

15. *All the methods by which God endeavours to amend the minds of men.*

Acts vii. 51. ὑμεῖς καὶ τῷ πνεύματι ἁγίῳ ἀντιπικνεύετε, ὡς οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν καὶ ὁμοῦς. comp. ver. 52 and 53.

16. *Divine afflatus, or inspiration, a divine oracle.*

Matth. xxii. 43. πῶς οὐ Δαυὶδ ἐν πνεύματι κυρίου αὐτοῦ καλεῖ; how then does David, singing by divine inspiration of the times of the Messiah, call him Lord? Comp. Mark xiii. 36.

Luke i. 41. καὶ ἐπλησθὲ πνεύματος ἁγίου ἡ ελισβετ Elizabeth, in-

structed by a divine oracle concerning the illustrious dignity and eminent condition of Mary, thus addressed her. Ib. 67.

Luke ii. 25. πνεῦμα ἢ ἁγίου ἐκ' αὐτοῦ he sometimes had a divine revelation.

Ib. 26. καὶ ἢ αὐτῇ κεχηρηματισμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου he had been instructed by a divine oracle. Ib. 27.

Luke iv. 1. ἢ τοῦ πνεύματος admonished by a divine oracle. Others render it, and not badly upon the whole, *of his own accord* (suā sponte) or by a *certain mental impulse*. But the opinion of those who contend that ἢ τοῦ πνεύματος is the same thing with *in extasi* *quodam* in a kind of ecstasy, is entirely inadmissible,* and wholly in opposition to the parallel places, Mark. i. 12. and Matth. iv. 1. which favor the other mode of explanation.

Ibid. iv. 18. πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐκ' οὐρα by divine order and commission I preach.

Acts viii. 29. το πνεῦμα, compared with ver. 26. where it was called ἀγγελος κυρίου.

Ibid. 39. πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐρεῖται τοῖς Φίλιπποις Philip was commanded by a divine oracle to return, and remain no longer with the eunuch. Ibid. x. 19. xi. 12.

Ib. xi. 28. ἡρώδης δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος admonished by a divine oracle he foretold.

* [This remark seems to be levelled at Farmer's interpretation of this text in support of his theory of the temptation. Although Schleusener pronounces this interpretation of the places absolutely inadmissible yet under No. 5. he has said that certain passages in the Apocalypse, on the phraseology of which Farmer greatly relies, such as Apoc. xvii. 3. xxi. 10. may be interpreted of a "prophetic" "ecstasy or vision."

Most of the texts under this No. 16. are considered by Farmer, in his Inquiry &c. (p. 50—70. ed. 1805. 12mo.) and explained as they are here; with this difference however; that Farmer is frequently disposed to make it appear that there is something more in the phrases ἢ πνεύματος &c. than *by divine direction*; and that they imply a powerful operation of the Spirit on the mind, which may be supposed to place it in a state similar to that in which Christ's was during the visionary temptation.—He interprets Luke iv. 18. of the extraordinary gifts and powers with which our Saviour was endowed.

There is no subject involved in greater difficulties than the use of πνεῦμα and πνεῦμα ἁγίου in the sense given to it in this number; and the difficulties are not diminished by examining the correspondent use of the Hebrew phrases of the Old Testament.—The references to Josephus direct us to passages where he gives an account of the prophetic inspiration of Balaam and Saul, and are worthy of attention. In Havercamp's Josephus it is τὸ Δεῦν μ. π. and not as quoted by Schl.]

Ib. xiii. 2. οὗτοι το πνεῦμα το ἅγιον one of the teachers and prophets of the church at Antioch was admonished by a divine response.—Ib. ver. 4. xvi. 6. 7. xx. 23. xxi. 4. 11. xxiii. 8. 9.

1 Cor. xii. 3. οὐδὲς ἐν πνεύματι θεῷ λαλῶν no man who speaks by the impulse of the divine spirit.—1 Pet. i. 11.—2 Pet. i. 21.—Josephus Antiq. Jud. Lib. iv. c. 6. § 5. vi. c. 11. § 5. τὸ θεῷ μοναρχοῦσιν πνεύματος καὶ προφητείας ἐξέχοντο.

17. *Religion, taken objectively, and particularly the Christian religion, because the most holy and excellent of all.*

1 Cor. ii. 12. where το πνεῦμα το κόσμου religion invented by men, is opposed to τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ religion truly divine.

John iii. 5. ἵνα μὴ τις γινώσκῃ ἐκ πνεύματος unless a man by means of the Christian religion be changed for the better, and altogether reformed. Ib. ver. 6. and 8.

Acts ix. 31. τὴ παρακλήσει τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος the joy which they felt in the favorable progress of the Christian religion.—In the same manner should be explained the words c. xiii. 52. χαρὰς καὶ πνευματικὸς ἄγγελος.

Rom. vii. 6. where καινότης πνεύματος, that is, the very excellent Christian religion lately introduced, is opposed to τὴ παλαιότητα γραμμάτων the Mosaic religion, which had been formerly in force, but was now entirely abrogated. Ibid. viii. 1.

Rom. xiv. 17. χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἄγῳ the disposition to make others cheerful, which is excited and promoted in a man by the Christian religion.

Ib. xv. 13. ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος ἁγίου by means of the Christian religion.

Ib. 30. διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ πνεύματος by the love which the Christian religion requires and produces.

1 Cor. ii. 10. ὅμοι δι ἀποκαλύψεως ὁ θεὸς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ ib. 11. το πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ the religion which comes from God.

Ibid. 14. οὐ δέχεται τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ θεοῦ does not by his assent approve the divine doctrine. Ib. xii. 13. ἐν ἡμῖν πνεύματι.

2 Cor. iii. 6. πνεῦμα is the same thing with the preceding καινὴ διαθήκη, and is opposed to τὸ γράμματι.*

Ib. 8. διακονία τοῦ πνεύματος the office of delivering the Christian religion, which in ver. 9. is called ἡ διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης.

Ib. 17. ὁ θεὸς κυριεύει τοῦ πνεύματος ἡμεῖς the Lord signifies in this place the

* [In the original it is τὸ πνεῦματι; but this must be a mistake.]

Christian religion. ὃ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα κυρίου, καὶ αὐτοῦ, but where the Christian religion really exists and exerts its influence, there is true liberty.

Ib. 18. ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος through Christ, the author of the religion we profess.

Galat. iii. 3. ἐκζητοῦντες πνεύματι will ye, who had already arrived at a sublimer acquaintance with that more perfect religion, the Christian, νυνὶ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐπιτελεσθῆναι now return to the imperfect religion of Moses.

Ephes. iii. 5. ἐν πνεύματι for διὰ πνεύματος.

Coloss. i. 8. ἐν πνεύματι by the revelation of the Christian religion.

1 Thess. iv. 8. τοῖς δοτὰς τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῷ τὸ ἅγιον οἱς ἡμεῖς to whom we owe the benefit of the Christian religion, which we profess.

Hebr. x. 29. τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνδύσεως rejecting the Christian religion, the best of God's blessings.

James iv. 5. πρὸς φθόνον ἐπιπλεῖν τὸ πνεῦμα, ὃ παρταίνει ἐν ἡμῖν the Christian religion, which comes from God resists, or contends against envy.*

* [A most excellent interpretation of a part of a very obscure passage. But he cites no other passage in the New Testament for the meaning given to ἐπιπλεῖν. See Schleusn. ad verb.]

The fifth and sixth verses as they stand in our English bibles are almost unintelligible. "Do ye think that the scripture saith in vain. The spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth to envy? But he giveth more grace: wherefore he saith God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace unto the humble. Submit therefore" &c.

The quotation in the fifth verse is not to be found in our scriptures. It is supposed to be taken from some lost apocryphal book. Some have thought there might be a reference to Prov. xxi. 10. Others have supposed that James had in view a passage in Paul's epistle to the Galatians, v. 17. sqq.—The two verses have been differently pointed and explained by different commentators. Some have chosen to consider the fifth verse as the words of James himself; speaking generally of the doctrines of scripture: So Dr. Macknight; "do ye think that the scripture speaketh falsely? And doth the spirit who dwelleth in us strongly incline to rage? No. But he giveth greater grace. For he saith i. e. in scripture."—Others put a stop after φθόνον, and not after λέγει; and render thus, "do ye think that the scripture speaketh in vain against envy? The Spirit which dwelleth in us excites the utmost affection, [ἐπιπλεῖν] for it bestows greater favor"—Others, again, have thought that the apostle in the fifth verse expresses in a free manner the sense of the quotation from Proverbs in the sixth verse.—Perhaps the following mode of pointing and rendering the passage, putting a comma after ἐν ἡμῖν, and the note of interrogation after χαρὶν, may be thought worthy of attention, as it makes the little clause μισῶν δὲ δίδωσι χαρὶν a part of the quotation, Think ye that the scripture speaketh in vain, "the spirit which dwelleth in us is contrary to envy, for it bestoweth on us greater benefits;" [that is, than those earthly goods which are the usual objects of envy.] See Gal. v. 17.]

1 Pet. iv. 14. that by the words το της δεξης και δυναμεις και το το θου πνευμα is here described the very excellent religion of Christ, which because it originates from God, confers the greatest dignity on man, and furnishes him with power to perform the greatest things, is plainly taught in the following words κατω μιν αυτες βλασφημαται, κατω δε ημεις δεξαμενται.

1 John iv. 13. οτι εκ του πνευματος αυτου δεδομεν ημιν. [because he has granted us the gospel?]

1 John v. 6. οτι το πνευμα οστιν ε αληθινον the Christian religion is truly divine. But πνευμα can be conveniently understood of Christ himself, as the Vulgate interprets it; but the sense is nearly the same.*

18. *Perfect knowledge of the Christian religion.*

Galat. v. 5. ημεις γαρ πνευματι εκ πιστης ελπιδα δικαιοσυνης απευχεσμεθα but we who are taught better by Christ (or from our more perfect knowledge of the Christian religion) hope to obtain by our diligent observance of the gospel that Christian felicity which is promised to us.

Ephes. v. 9. ε γαρ καρπος του πνευματος the works which proceed from a perfect and adequate knowledge of the Christian religion; where instead of πνευματος some MSS. have φωνης, which in my opinion is a gloss.

19. *All the benefits and advantages connected with a perfect knowledge and observance of the Christian religion relating both to the present, and the future life, and obtained for men by Christ.†*

Matth. iii. 11. (Mark i. 8. Luke iii. 16.) αυτες ημεις βαπτισται εκ πνευματι αγιου I am not ignorant, that most interpreters after Grotius, explain these words of the outpouring of the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit. But as the speech of John was addressed to all the Jews who had come together to his baptism, these words of his αδιος

* [It may be permitted to query whether the passages under this seventeenth head are so happily or correctly explained as under some of the preceding. Particularly in Acts ix. 31. Rom. xiv. 17. 1 Thess. iv. 8. 1 John iv. 13. πνευμα seems to be more easily referable to the fourteenth head of signification. And the important passage 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11. deserved a full and accurate explication; for it is difficult to make any sense of it by interpreting πνευμα of the Christian religion.]

† [Or, bestowed on men by Christ; per Christum hominibus parts, are the words of the author, and are probably left thus equivocal not without design.]

ἡμῶς βαπτίσαν, which answer to the words εἰς βαπτίζω ἡμᾶς, require us to determine the sense of the passage to be this: he shall abundantly bestow upon you all the blessings and benefits of his religion. Nor does the addition of the words καὶ πνεῖ render this explication uncertain, or doubtful; for πνεῖ signifies here, *very heavy punishments on the despisers of religion*. Comp. ver. 12. and Glasse Philol. Sacr. p. 1057. (The words καὶ πνεῖ are commonly thought to have been added as explanatory (ἐξηγητικῶς) and are omitted not only by John i. 33. Mark i. 8. but even in some MSS. perhaps out of antipathy to certain heretics who used branding for washing; or on account of the parallel places.)

John vii. 39.—Acts ii. 38. καὶ ληψέσθι τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος.*

Rom. v. 5. For the love of God has been abundantly and clearly declared to us διὰ ἁγίου πνεύματος, τὴν δωρεάν ἡμῶν by the benefits, which we have by the Christian religion enjoyed. In what follows we find remission of sins mentioned, for which we are indebted to Christ.

Ibid. viii. 23. ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες but those also, who have partaken of those most excellent benefits, bestowed on men by Christ, [or procured for men by Christ.] Theodoret on ver. 26. τὸ πνεῦμα τὴν διδωμένην τοῖς πιστοῦσι χάριν.

2 Cor. i. 22. δις τοὶ ἀρρώσθῃσι τοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ταῖς παρθεναῖς ἡμῶν to whom we are indebted for the benefits, procured by Christ, which are as a pledge to us of future felicity. Ibid. v. 5.—Galat. iii. 2. 5. 14.

Ephes. i. 13. εὐφρανέσθε τῷ πνεύματι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῇ ἁγίᾳ you have enjoyed all the promised blessings belonging to the Christian religion, which are most certain proofs and pledges of your future felicity.

1 Thess. v. 19. τὸ πνεῦμα μὴ σβέννῃτε use well the advantages, which, as Christians, you enjoy, and study in every way to increase them.

Heb. vi. 4. μέτοχος γενέσθαι πνεύματος ἁγίου.

20. In particular: *the temper of mind, made better by the Christian religion.*

Rom. viii. 2. ὁ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος καὶ ζωῆς the Christian religion,

* [The former of these passages has been already explained under No. 14. and the other may be referred to the same head of signification.]

which improves the minds of men, impels to right conduct and renders happy: here πνεῦμα is opposed to τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ or that general wickedness,* to which before the coming of Christ men had been addicted; as in *ibid.* ver. 5. 6. 9. it is opposed to τῇ σαρκί.—*Ibid.* ver. 11. 13. 14. 16. ἀντὶ τοῦ πνεύματος this very disposition, corrected by means of the Christian religion, assures our mind—[see Nos. 5. and 6.]—*ibid.* 26. τοῦ πνεύματος συναντιλαμβάνεται ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν this disposition, corrected by the Christian religion, sustains us oppressed with calamities.†

1 Cor. iii. 16. vi. 19. ὅτι τὸ σῶμα ἡμῶν ἵκεν τῷ ὁμῶν ὄντι πνευματικόν even that your body is as it were a temple, sacred to God, in which you ought to manifest to others your truly Christian disposition.

Galat. v. 16. πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε live conformably to the disposition which the Christian religion requires.—*Ibid.* ver. 17. 18. 22. 25.—vi. 8.—Ephes. v. 18.—1 Tim. iv. 12.

Jude 19. πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες men not yet reformed by the Christian religion.

21. *The divine influence, by the aid of which men are disposed to embrace, and inclined to observe the Christian religion.*

John vi. 63. τὸ πνεῦμα ὁ θεὸς ζῶντων it is God who enables men, or qualifies them to embrace the Christian religion, the same as in ver. 65. αὐτοὶ δύναται εἶδέναι πρὸς με, καὶ μὴ ἡ διδασκαλία αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ με.‡

* [The word in the original is *vitiositas*, which cannot be better explained than in the words of Cicero: *malitia certè cujusdam vitii nomen est, vitiositas omnium.*]

† [It is easy to see how Schleusener understands this chapter of the epistle to the Romans; but it is not always easy to determine when πνεῦμα means the Christian religion itself, and when the state of mind, disposition, and character, which is the effect of its influence. The interpretations here given seem to exclude not only the person of the Holy Spirit, but what are called his extraordinary influences from several passages, in which they are commonly supposed to be taught.]

‡ [τὸ πνεῦμα here seems to be opposed to ἡ σὰρξ, and therefore many interpreters have supposed that our Saviour means by it the *spiritual* in opposition to the *liberal* meaning of his discourse, an interpretation which is much favored by the next clause: “the words which I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.”—Simpson in his *Essays on the language of scripture*, gives the following translation of verses 62 and 63. “Nevertheless, when ye shall see the son of man rise up where he was before, [ye will know] that he is the Spirit that giveth life. The flesh profiteth nothing. The doctrines which I teach you are spirit and are life.” Compare 1 Cor. xv. 45. 2 Cor. iii. 6, 17. John xi. 22. 25.]

Rom. xv. 13. The same divine power is called *δυναμις πνεύματος ἁγίου*.—Ib. ver. 16. and 19.

1 Cor. vi. 11. *πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ* is so distinguished from *τῷ νομοῦ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ* that it appears it must be understood of the aid of the divine spirit necessary to embrace and observe the Christian religion.—

2 Cor. iii. 3.—xiii. 14.*

Ephes. iii. 16. *δυναμὶς κραταιοῦναι διὰ τὸ πνεῦμα* ἵνα ὡς τοῦ ἱεροῦ αὐθροῦν that we may daily acquire an increase of Christian virtue, by the aid of the divine spirit.

Ibid. iv. 30. *μὴ λυπῶντι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τοῦ Θεοῦ* do not resist that divine spirit, to whose assistance a Christian is indebted for every increase of his faith and virtue.

Titus iii. 5. *πυλὴ γένεσις* and *ἀπακαθάρσις* is ascribed to the *πνεύματι ἁγίῳ*.

1 Thess. i. 5. 6.—2 Thess. ii. 13. *ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος*. 1 Pet. i. 22.—Jude 20.

22. By a metonymy of the abstract for the concrete it is put for *πνευματικός*, and admits of various significations according to the various meanings of *πνεῦμα*, which may be easily discovered from the tenor of the discourse.

John iii. 6. *τὸ γεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος πνεῦμα ἐστὶ* he, who is reformed by the Christian religion, also thinks, wills, and acts as the Christian religion requires; or is *πνευματικός*.

Acts v. 3. *ψεύσασθαι εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἁγίου* that you should attempt to deceive us apostles, who are endowed *τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ* that is, who have received extraordinary divine gifts, who have God always with us, aiding us by his spirit, so that we can easily distinguish truth from falsehood.

Ibid. 9. *πειράσσει τὸ πνεῦμα κυρίου* to try whether the apostles can be deceived, and whether they really have extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit.

Acts xx. 28. *τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἁγίου* Paul, who had appointed the presbyters of the Ephesian church.

1 Cor. xii. 10. *ἀλλὰ δὲ διακρίσεις πνευματικῶν* to another is granted

* [This passage in Corinthians, which is the common benediction, "the grace" &c. may as well be referred to the nineteenth head, especially as Schleusener had already classed under that head Heb. vi. 4. which is certainly a parallel text. They both however may refer to the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, and so may several other texts under this head.]

the faculty of distinguishing false prophets from true. Chrysostom: το ἰδοὺαι τις ὁ πνευματικὸς καὶ τις μὴ, τις ὁ προφῆτης καὶ τις ὁ ἀπώστης.

Ibid. xiv. 32. καὶ πνεύματα προφητῶν προφηταῖς ὑποτάσσονται prophets inspired by God (οἱ προφῆται πνευματικοί) ought to give way to one another.

2 Thess. ii. 2. ὁ δὲ πνεύματος by a teacher who professes to be actuated by the divine spirit.

1 Tim. iv. 1. προσέχοντες πνεύμασι πλάταις comp. ver. 2.

1 John iv. 1. 2. το πνεῦμα τοῦ θ̄ου a teacher truly divine. Ibid ver. 3. and 6.

23. Sometimes it is clearly *redundant*.* Mark ii. 8. *συνοχῆς ὁ ἰσχυρὸς τῷ πνεύματι αὐτῷ* compared with Matth. ix. 4. and Luke v. 22. —Luke i. 47. *συνάλλασθε τὸ πνεῦμα μου* compared with Psalm xxxv. 9. [Sept.] Luke x. 21. *συνάλλασθε τῷ πνεύματι ὁ ἰσχυρὸς*.—John xi. 33.—xiii. 21.—Acts xvii. 16.—xviii. 5. [see however No. 5].—Ephes. i. 17.—iv. 23.—Philip. i. 19.—3 Esdras iii. 2. Consult Le Moynes *Varia Sacra* p. 927.

These are all the places where the word is found in the New Testament.†

The following references will direct you to what is most worthy of being read on this word.

Koppe Excursus v. on the Epistle to the Gal. p. 101. sq.

Teller (G. A.) Vocabulary of the New Testament in German, under the word *Geist*.

* [Let the student turn to the texts classed under No. 5, and he will probably think that the list of passages where πνεῦμα is redundant might have been much enlarged.]

† [Schleusner has entirely omitted the important texts Luke xi. 13. John xx. 22. which he would probably refer to the third class of significations—the latter half of Rom. viii. 26. is nowhere explained; though under ὑπερευαγγέλιον he gives πνεῦμα the same meaning as in the former part of this verse.—He has also omitted even to mention the most difficult passages relating to the spiritual gifts in the Corinthian church, such as 1 Cor. xii. 8, 9, xi. xiv. 2, 14, 15, 16. and though from other parts of his Lexicon we suppose he would have referred most of them to No. 16. we are by no means satisfied with this singular omission, especially as this very subject of the spiritual gifts had for some time engaged the attention of the most learned theologians in Germany. Other texts omitted are John xx. 22. Acts vii. 55. Rom. v. 5. viii. 4, xi. xi. 8. 2 Cor. vii. 1. xii. 18. Ephes. ii. 2, 18. Philem. 25. 1 Pet. iii. 4. 1 John iii. 24. and Apoc. xvi. 13, 14.]

Matthew.	Chap. Ver.	No.	Chap. Ver.	No.	Chap. Ver.	No.
Chap. Ver. No.						
i. 18. } 11	v. 2. }		vii. 21. }	9	xi. 33. }	23
— 20. }	— 8.13. }	9	— viii. 2. }		xiii. 21. }	
iii. 11. - 19	vi. 7. }		— 29. }	8, 9	xiv. 17. }	
— 16. - 11	vii. 25. }		— 55. - 2		— 26. }	10
iv. 1. - 16	viii. 12. - 5		ix. 39. }	9	xv. 26. }	
v. 3. - 5	ix. 17. }		— 42. }		xvi. 13. }	
viii. 16. - 9	— 20. }	9	— 55. - 6		xix. 30. - 2	
x. 1. - 8	— 25. }		x. 20. - 9		xx. 22. - 0	
— 20. }	xii. 36. - 16		— 21. - 23			
xii. 18. } 13	xiii. 11. - 13		xi. 13. - 0			
— 28. }	xiv. 38. - 5		— 24. }	9	Acts.	
— 31. }			— 26. }		i. 2. - 12	
— 32. }			xii. 10. - 12		— 5. }	14
— 43. }			— 12. - 13		— 8. }	
— 45. }			xiii. 11. - 8		— 16. - 10	
xxii. 43. - 16			xxiii. 46. - 5		ii. 4. - 14, 6	
xxvi. 41. - 5			xxiv. 37. }	4	— 17. }	
xxvii. 50. - 2					— 18. }	14
xxviii. 19. - 10					— 33. }	
					— 38. }	
					iv. 8. - 13	
					— 25. - 10	
					— 31. - 13	
					v. 3, 9. - 23	
					— 16. - 9	
					— 32. - 14	
					vi. 3. }	
					— 5. }	13
					— 10. }	
					vii. 51. - 15	
					— 55. - 0	
					— 59. - 5	
					viii. 7. - 9	

Chap. Ver. No.	Chap. Ver. No.	Chap. Ver. No.	Chap. Ver. No.
viii. 15. } 14	— 5,6,9. - 20	xv. 45. - 7,10	vi. 17. - 10
17, 18, 19. } 14	viii. 10. - 5	xvi. 18. - 5	— 18. - 5
viii. 29, 39. - 16	— 11. - 0		
ix. 17. - 14	— 11, 13, 14. - 20	2 Corinthians.	Philippians.
— 31. - 17	— 15. - 6	i. 22. - 19	i. 19. - 28
x. 19. - 16	— 16. - 5, 6, 20	ii. 13. - 5	— 27. } 6
— 38. - 12	— 23. - 19	iii. 3. - 21	ii. 1. } 6
44, 45. } 14	— 26. - 20, 0	— 6. } 17	iii. 3. - 5
47. } 14	— 27. - 5	— 8. } 17	
xi. 12. - 16	ix. 1. - 10	— 17. } 17	Colossians.
xi. 15, 16. - 14	xi. 8. - 0	— 18. } 17	i. 2. - 17
— 24. - 13	xii. 11. - 5	iv. 13. - 6	ii. 5. - 5
— 28. } 16	xiv. 17. - 17	v. 5. - 19	
xiii. 2, 4. } 16	xv. 13. - 17, 21	vi. 6. - 14	1 Thess.
— 9. - 14	— 16. } 21	vii. 1. - 0	i. 5, 6. - 21
— 52. - 17	— 19. } 21	— 13. - 5	iv. 8. - 17
xv. 8. - 14	— 30. - 17	xi. 4. - 14	v. 19. - 19
— 28. - 10		xii. 18. - 0	— 23. - 5
xvi. 6, 7. - 16	1 Corinthians.	xiii. 14. - 14	
— 16. - 8	ii. 4. - 13		2 Thess.
— 18. - 9	— 10. - 17	Galatians.	ii. 2. - 22
xvii. 16. - 23	— 11. - 17, 5	iii. 2. - 19	— 3. - 1
— 21. - 21	— 12. - 17	— 3. - 17	— 13. - 21
xviii. 5. - 5, 23	— 13. - 10	— 5. } 19	
— 25. - 5	— 14. - 17	— 14. } 19	1 Timothy.
xix. 2. } 14	iii. 16. - 20	iv. 6. - 6	iii. 16. - 12
— 6. } 14	iv. 21. - 6	— 29. - iii.	iv. 1. - 10, 22
— 12, 13. } 9	v. 3, 4. - 5	v. 5. - 18	— 12. - 20
— 15, 16. } 9	— 5. - 0	— 16. } 20	
— 21. } 5	vi. 11. - 21	17, 18. } 20	2 Timothy.
xx. 22. } 5	— 17. - 6	22, 25. } 20	i. 7. - 6
— 23. - 16	— 19. - 20	vi. 1. - 6	— 14. - 13
— 28. - 22	— 21. - 5	— 8. - 20	iv. 22. - 5
xxi. 4, 11. - 16	vii. 34. - 5	— 18. - 8	
xxii. 22. - 5	— 40. - 13		Titus.
xxiii. 8, 9. - 16	xii. 3. - 16	Ephesians.	iii. 5. - 21
xxviii. 25. - 10	— 3, 4. - 10	i. 13. - 19	
	— 7. - 14	— 17. - 23	Philemon.
Romans.	— 8, 9. - 0	ii. 2, 18. - 0	— 25. - 0
i. 4. - 10	— 10. - 22	— 22. - 5	
— 9. } 5	— 11. - 0	iii. 5. - 17	
ii. 29. } 5	— 13. - 17, 6	— 16. - 21	Hebrews.
v. 5. - 19	xiv. 2. - 0	iv. 3, 4. - 6	i. 7. - 3
vii. 6. } 17	— 12. - 14	— 23. - 23	i. 14. - 7
viii. 1. } 17	— 14, 15. } 0	— 30. - 21	ii. 4. - 14
— 2. - 20	— 16. } 0	v. 9. - 18	iii. 7. - 10
— 4. - 0	— 32. - 22	— 18. - 20	iv. 12. - 5

Chap. Ver. No.	Chap. Ver. No.	Chap. Ver. No.	Chap. Ver. No.
vi. 4. - 19	— 22. - 21	v. 6. - 12, 17	— 6, 13. } 10
ix. 8. - 10	iii. 4. - 0	— 8. - 12	22. } 10
— 14. - 2	— 18. - 5, 10		iv. 2. - 5
x. 15. - 10	— 19. - 4		— 5. } 8
— 29. - 17	iv. 6. - 5	Jude.	v. 6. } 8
xii. 23. - 4	— 14. - 17	19. - 20	xi. 11. - 1
— 9. - 5		20. - 21	xiii. 15. - 2
James.	2 Peter.		xiv. 13. - 10
ii. 26. - 4	i. 21. - 16		xvi. 13, 14. - 0
iv. 5. - 17		Apocalypse.	xvii. 3. - 5
1 Peter.	1 John.	i. 4. - 8	xviii. 2. - 8
i. 2. - 10	iii. 24. - 0	— 10. - 5	xix. 10. - 14
— 11. - 16	iv. 1, 2. } 22	ii. 7, 11. } 10	xxi. 10. - 5
— 12. - 13	— 3, 6. } 22	— 17, 29. } 10	xxii. 17. - 10
	— 13. - 17	iii. 1. - 8	

ERRATA in the preceding translation.

Those of the following errors to which Sc. is prefixed are copied from Schleusner They are corrected in the index.

Sc. p. 301, line 13, for (ver.) "36," read (ver.) 37.

— — 15, for (ver.) "28," read (ver.) 39. (Sc. has it 38.)

Sc. 302, — 5, from bottom, for (ver.) "12," read (ver.) 13.

307, — 12, for "Luke xii." read Luke xi.

Sc. 309, — 14 and 15 lines from bottom, for "iii. 6, 22, 23," read iii. 6, 13, 22.

Sc. — — 6 from bottom, for "Rom. i. 25," read Rom. i. 4.

— — 2 from bottom, for "Mark xiii." read Mark xii.

N.B. Where the Roman numerals are used in the third column, the numbers refer to the general divisions of the article.

The texts followed by a cipher in the third column are not noticed by Schleusner, as is mentioned page 323—note.

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

[In the last number of the Repository, some account was promised of the rare and valuable books, among those lately added to the Library of Harvard College. This account is now commenced. It will not however be confined merely to the books lately added, but will be extended to those of a similar kind, which were before in the library. Notices of the lives of the authors of the different works, where these may be interesting, and any other incidental information relating to them, which may be valuable or amusing to the general reader, will likewise be inserted. After entirely finishing the account of books lately added, notices in continuance may perhaps be given of remarkable books, which have been for some time in this library, and at least of any important additions, which may hereafter be made. This account is now commenced by descriptions of the four principal Polyglots, the three first of which have lately been added. Books lately added will throughout be distinguished by an asterisk.]

AN ACCOUNT OF BOOKS IN THE LIBRARY OF HARVARD COLLEGE.

* *The Complutensian Polyglot.*

THIS work is a very great literary curiosity. It is the first edition of the whole Bible ever printed. It has its name from the place where the work was executed, anciently called Complutum, now Alcala; a town of Spain, in New Castile. It was published by the direction and under the patronage of Cardinal Ximenes, the regent of Spain during the minority of Charles V, a man, who in high station not only as an ecclesiastic, but as a statesman and a soldier, has acquired as great and as deserved reputation, with as little mixture of merited censure, as with very few exceptions, is ever possessed by any one so variously and so publicly employed. With regard to this work, he employed various learned men to superintend and assist in its publication. He collected manuscripts, whenever it was in his power, giving four thousand ducats for seven of the Hebrew Bible; and defrayed the whole expense of the undertaking,

amounting to fifty thousand ducats.* It was begun in 1503, completed in 1517, and the Pope's bull permitting the sale of copies was obtained in 1520.

In the year in which the printing of the work was completed, the Cardinal died. It is an interesting anecdote related of him by the writer of his life, as copied by Le Long. "I have heard," says Gomez, "that John Brocar, a printer of Alcalá, the son of Arnold William Brocar, often related to his companions, that on the very day on which his father finished the printing of the work, he then a boy was sent in an elegant dress with the last volume of the Bible to Ximenes, who exceedingly rejoiced, and raising his eyes exclaimed—Christ, I thank thee, that thou hast brought that on which I have expended so much care to its desired accomplishment. Then turning to his friends he said, though I have been engaged indeed in many arduous and difficult undertakings for the service of the state, there is nothing, my friends, for which you ought more to congratulate me, than on account of this edition of the Bible, which alone, at a time when it is very necessary, opens the sacred fountains of our religion, whence a much purer theology will be drawn, than from the streams that have flowed from them, [alluding to this as containing the scriptures in their original languages, and to their having been usually consulted in a translation]." In his preface, or dedication to Leo X, he speaks in a similar manner. In giving his motives for printing the scriptures in their original languages, he says, "that there are in every language peculiar meanings of words, whose whole force can be expressed by no translation exact as it can be made; and that this is especially true of that, in which are contained the words of our Lord; that there are many and different hidden senses of words and sentences of scripture, which can only be discovered in the original language; and that besides, the manuscripts of the Latin translation differ from each other, and there being reason to believe, that through the ignorance and carelessness of transcribers, their text does not remain uncorrupted, recourse must be had to the originals of the scriptures. These there-

* See his life by Gomez, as quoted by Le Long.

"fore are printed by him, that every one, studious of sacred literature, may no longer be stopt at the streams, but may satisfy his thirst at the fountain itself, springing up to eternal life." The editors likewise at the end of their preface to the New Testament, thus address their readers:—"There now remains no reason for not studying the scriptures. You cannot complain of faulty copies, of suspected translations, and of inability to obtain the original text; nothing is required but your own inclination and industry, and if these are not wanting, you will without doubt after having once tasted the sweetness of sacred literature, despise all other studies." "In this manner," observes Michaelis, "did the editors write, under the patronage of a zealous catholic cardinal, only a short time before the Reformation." The court of Rome however had not the same desire to encourage the study of the scriptures as Cardinal Ximenes, and it was, as we have seen, three years after the printing of the Polyglot, before a bull could be obtained for its publication. In the preface of the editors however, there is a very singular passage respecting the Vulgate, not at first sight very consistent with what has been quoted. After mentioning that they have placed the Greek of the Septuagint on one side and the original Hebrew on the other, in the Old Testament, they say:—"Between these we have put the Latin translation of St. Jerom, as it were between the synagogue and the Eastern [Greek] church: placing Jesus, that is, the Roman or Latin church, between these two thieves. For this alone, founded upon a firm rock, the others sometimes deviating from the right understanding of scripture, has always remained immoveable in the truth."* This passage however is equivocally constructed.

Before the publication of the Complutensian Polyglot, appeared the edition of Erasmus, the first of the New Testament. This was attacked by Lopez de Stunica, one of the editors of

* *Mediam autem inter has Latinam beati Hieronymi translationem, velut inter synagogam et orientalem ecclesiam, posuimus: tanquam duos hinc et inde latrones medium autem Jesum, hoc est Romanam sive Latinam ecclesiam collocantes. Hæc enim sola supra firmam petram ædificata (reliquis a recta scripturæ intelligentia quandoque deviantibus) immobilis semper veritate permansit.*

the Complutensian Polyglot, which attack produced a warm contest between him and Erasmus. "It is mentioned," says Butler in his *Horæ Biblicæ*, "in one of the letters of Erasmus, [tom. ix. 228. and see *Hist. Lit. Reformationis*, part i. 60, 61.] that Stunica, having found Cardinal Ximenes reading Erasmus' edition of the New Testament, expressed his surprise, that his Eminence should vouchsafe even to cast a look upon a work, so full, as he termed it, of faults and monstrous errors; that the Cardinal with great gravity reproved Stunica for his insolence; and desired him, if he could, to produce a more valuable work, and in the mean time, not to defame the labors of others. The anecdote does honor to the cardinal's memory, as it shows his candor, and how free he was from that little jealousy of authors, which was one of the strange blemishes in the character of the great rival of his political fame, the Cardinal minister of Lewis XIII."

The Polyglot strictly speaking is in five volumes; the four first contain the books of the Old Testament, with those of the apocrypha, which are considered canonical by the church of Rome,* together with the prayer of Manasseh, (which is put after the Chronicles,) and the third book of Maccabees. On each page of the books of the Old Testament, there are three parallel columns; the first contains the Hebrew, the second the Vulgate, and the third the Septuagint, with an interlined version. Beside these, the Chaldee paraphrase (the Targum of Onkelos) is put at the bottom of the page in the Pentateuch,† with a Latin translation in

* The books of the apocrypha received by the Romish church as canonical according to the decree of the Council of Trent, are as follow: Tobit, Judith, The Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, the first and second Books of Maccabees, Baruch and the epistle of Jeremiah as connected with Jeremiah and the Lamentations, the addition to Esther, and the additions to Daniel, viz. The song of the three Children, The story of Susannah, and that of the Idol Bel and the Dragon. The books of the Apocrypha rejected by it are the two of Esdras and the prayer of Manasseh.

† Some bibliographers speak as if the Chaldee paraphrase to the other books of the Old Testament was in this Polyglot, but this is not the case. According to the opinion of the editors, as given in their general preface, *Chaldaica in exteris libris, preterquam in Pentateucho, corrupta est aliquibus in locis; et fabulis merisque Thalmudistarum nugis conspersa: indigna prorsus, quæ sacris codicibus inseratur.*

a parallel column. In the books of the apocrypha, the Greek with an interlined version is printed in one column, and the Vulgate in another. In the third book of Maccabees the Greek alone is printed with an interlined version, this book not being translated in the Vulgate. In the margin of the Old Testament are put Hebrew radicals, and in the Pentateuch, opposite the Chaldee version, Chaldee radicals. These are put in the Hebrew, when the root does not consist of the three or two first letters of the word in the text, or of these after a prefix is rejected, over which there is then a certain mark, with the rejection likewise of the letter vau, when it occurs; and in a similar manner in the Chaldee. The fifth volume contains the New Testament in the Greek, and in the Latin of the Vulgate. In the margin there are references to similar passages in the Old Testament to those in the opposite text. To each word, or phrase which may be rendered into Latin by a single word, in the Hebrew of the Old, and in the Greek of the New Testament, a small letter is prefixed, which is likewise prefixed to the word or words corresponding in the Latin vulgate. To the New Testament is annexed a Greek Lexicon of its words. Beside the five volumes, which contain the Polyglot, there is a sixth (not belonging to the set in the library of Harvard College) containing a Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon. Copies of this volume were very early separated from the sets to which they belonged. Gomez, who wrote the life of Cardinal Ximenes about 1560, complains of its being so in his time.

There has been much controversy, principally in Germany, between Goeze on the one side, and Semler on the other, respecting the critical value of the Greek text of the New Testament in this Polyglot; it being attacked by the latter and defended by the former. The opinion of Semler however, that it is of little critical value, and formed principally on modern manuscripts, seems to have prevailed. The manuscripts however, on which it was formed, now being lost,* it retains some

* As the story of the loss of these manuscripts, though somewhat famous, may not be known to all our readers, we insert the following account from Michaelis' Introduction to the New Testament. While there was this dispute concerning the value of the manuscripts, from which the Complutensian text was formed, "it was natural," says Michaelis, "for

authority. "Mill, Bengel, and Wetstein," says Michaelis, "have collated this edition, as a manuscript, with great diligence." It is occasionally quoted by Griesbach, especially on the Apocalypse, in which Michaelis thinks its text particularly valuable. In the controversy between Archdeacon Travis, and Professor Porson and Herbert Marsh, respecting the celebrated text John v. 7. it was made much and successful use of by the latter for the purpose of disproving the pretended correctness of Stephens' third edition of the Greek Testament, in which it is employed as an authority.

"The Complutensian edition," says Michaelis, "is extremely scarce, because only six hundred impressions were taken off; it is wanting in many of the public libraries, and has not been many years even in that of Gottingen. This is the reason why so many different accounts have been given of it. It is too expensive for a private library; that which is now at Gottingen cost four hundred and eighty florins, and the late Münchhausen gave an order to his commissioner as far as nine hundred; and the price of it will still increase, in proportion as its great excellence, especially in the Septuagint, shall be better known." Four hundred and eighty florins of Germany is

"every friend to criticism to wish that the manuscripts used in this edition, which might be supposed to have been preserved at Alcala, should be collated anew; and in the third edition of this Introduction I expressed the same wish in speaking of the Codex Rhodiensis. But the inconceivable ignorance and stupidity of a librarian at Alcala, about the year 1749, has rendered it impossible that these wishes should ever be gratified. Professor Moldenhawer, who was in Spain in 1784, went to Alcala, for the very purpose of discovering those manuscripts: and being able to find none, suspected that they were designedly kept secret from him, though contrary to the generous treatment which he had at other times experienced in that country. At last he discovered that a very illiterate librarian, about thirty-five years before, who wanted room for some new books, sold the ancient vellum manuscripts to one Toryo, who dealt in fire works, as materials for making rockets. Oh, that I had it in my power to immortalize both librarian and rocket-maker! This prodigy of barbarism I would not venture to relate, till professor Tychsen, who accompanied Moldenhawer, had given me fresh assurances of its truth. I will not lay it to the charge of the Spanish nation in general, in which there are men of real learning; but the author of this inexcusable act was the greatest barbarian of the present century, and happy only in being unknown."

about two hundred and forty dollars. Its original price was six gold ducats and a half, or something more according to the expense of transportation, as mentioned in the address to the reader opposite the title page. This Polyglot had become very rare in 1568, when the printing of the Antwerp Polyglot was commenced as we are informed in one of the prefaces to the latter.* There are according to Goeze about fifteen copies of this work in Germany. That in the library of Harvard College is in very good preservation.

* *The Antwerp Polyglot.*

THIS work is as rare as the preceding, and remarkable for its great beauty and correctness of typography. It is in eight volumes, the five first containing the sacred and apocryphal books, the same as in the Complutensian, in different languages, with the addition of the two apocryphal books of Esdras in Latin only; and the three last an *apparatus* (as it is called) for their study. The Polyglot itself contains all that is in the Complutensian, revised and corrected; with the addition of a Chaldee paraphrase of the other books of the Old Testament, beside those of the Pentateuch, and its Latin translation, and the old Syriac version of the books of the New Testament, likewise with its Latin translation. In the Old Testament, the Hebrew and the Vulgate are put in parallel columns on one page, and the Septuagint with its translation in like manner on the page opposite: the translation of the Greek not being interlined as in the Complutensian. The Chaldee paraphrase is below; the original on one page, and its translation on the other. In the New Testament, the Greek and the Syriac with their translations are disposed in the same manner as the Hebrew and Greek of the Old Testament. Below, the Syriac is printed again in Hebrew letters. "The latter was done," says Michaelis, "with a view of rendering the New Testament intelligible to the Jews, and of converting them to the Christian religion, as we are informed by Guido Fabricius de la Boderie, who wrote for that purpose the Syriac text in Hebrew letters."† In

* Propter miram eorum paucitatem et raritatem desiderabantur.

† Introd. to N. T. c. 7. s. 2.

this work, those books and passages are not found in the Syriac which make no part of the Old Syriac version. Among the passages omitted are the story of the adulteress in the gospel of St. John, and 1 John vi 7.; the books omitted are the second epistle of Peter, the second and third of John, the epistle of Jude, and the Apocalypse.

The printing of this work was commenced at Antwerp in 1564, and finished in 1572. It was commenced and carried on under the patronage of Philip II of Spain, through the influence, as we are told in one of the prefaces, of Cardinal Spinoza. Its printer was Christopher Plantin, at that time one of the most celebrated in Europe: sixty workmen were continually employed during the time of its printing.* There is a story, that Philip only lent the money to defray the expense of its publication to Plantin, and afterwards distressed and reduced him to poverty, by pressing him for the debt. But this story is probably incorrect. According to several notices of the life of Plantin, he acquired great wealth by his profession, of which he lived in the liberal enjoyment, and at his death left a very valuable library to his grandson, Balthasar Moret. He died in 1598.

The principal editor of this Polyglot was Arias Montanus, who has the reputation of being one of the most learned theologians that Spain has ever produced. He was born of a noble but reduced family; his parents being unable to afford him the means of a learned education. He was however patronised by some gentlemen of Seville, and through their assistance, after having made some progress in his studies, was sent to pursue them at Alcalá. He there acquired great learning in the ancient and oriental languages. He afterwards travelled in different countries of Europe, and acquired a knowledge of various living languages. At his return he was invited by the bishop of Segovia to accompany him to the Council of Trent, then in session. Here he became known and distinguished. He returned however to Spain, and retired to a pleasant spot in the mountains of Andalusia, to devote himself to his studies in solitude and leisure. He was however invited from his

* Orat. Bened. Ariæ Montani ad Gregorium xiii. Pont. Max.

retreat by Philip II, to superintend the printing of the Polyglot of which we speak. For this purpose he went to Antwerp. While engaged in this work, his enemies occasioned him some difficulty at Rome, by accusing him of too closely following the interpretations of the Jewish Rabbies. On this account he made a voyage to Rome, and terminated the business without difficulty. After the completion of the Polyglot he returned to Spain, and refused the offer of a bishopric, which was made him by Philip. He received a pension of two thousand ducats, and was made chaplain to the king. He died in the year, 1598. He was remarkably abstemious, never drinking wine, and rarely eating meat. He is said to have been a man of piety, as well as of learning. His principal works are commentaries on the scriptures, and a number of dissertations, which fill the last volume of the Apparatus to this Polyglot, and which have been printed by themselves, under the title of *Antiquitates Judaicæ*. They are likewise printed in the *Critici Sacri*.

The Antwerp Polyglot is, as has been mentioned, very rare. Only five hundred copies were printed, and of these a large number are said to have been lost at sea on their passage to Spain.* The original price of each copy, as we learn from the Scaligerana, was forty pistoles. The copy in the library of Harvard College is a beautiful one in fine preservation.

* *The Paris Polyglot.*

THIS Polyglot contains the same books, and all that is in the preceding, with the addition of the Samaritan version of the Pentateuch, the Hebrew Samaritan text, (which consists of Hebrew words in Samaritan letters, and agrees very nearly in sense with the Samaritan version, so that the same Latin translation answers for both), the Syriac and Arabic versions of the books of the Old Testament and Apocrypha with some exceptions, the Syriac version of the remaining books of the

* Malinckrot de ortu et progressu artis typographicæ, quoted by Clement, *Bibliothèque Curieuse*.

New Testament, beside those whose version was given in the Antwerp Polyglot, and an Arabic version of the New Testament; all with their Latin translations. This Polyglot, which is the most magnificently executed of any, and one of the most splendid works that ever issued from the press, is printed on *imperial folio* in ten volumes of unwieldy size. Its printing was begun in 1628, and finished in 1645.

This work was published at the expense of a French gentleman, Guy Michael Le Jay, who ruined his fortune by the undertaking. Some time before its completion, Cardinal Richlieu made him an offer of one hundred thousand crowns, with the promise of providing for his family, on condition of the Polyglot's passing under the name of Richlieu. This offer was refused and the Cardinal became his enemy, and as it is said, endeavoured to injure the reputation of the work. He employed, according to Le Long, Simeon de Muis, a man celebrated in his time, to write a tract against it, which is still preserved in the *Musæum Renaldinum*, but was never published. The price which Le Jay originally put upon his Polyglot was two hundred crowns. The English booksellers offered to take six hundred copies at half price. This offer not being accepted, and the plan for printing the London Polyglot being soon after undertaken, that of Le Jay found a very difficult sale. Many copies were at last sold for nothing more than the value of their paper; so that he received no remuneration from this work for the expense laid out upon it and for the labor of seventeen years. He does not seem however to have experienced the sufferings of poverty. Having lost his wife, he became an ecclesiastic, was made Dean of Vezelai, and received from Louis XIV a *brevet* of counsellor of state. He died in 1675.

Copies of this Polyglot have now become rare. The copy in the library of Harvard College is in fine preservation,

The London Polyglot with Castell's Lexicon.

THE most complete of all the Polyglots is, as is well known, that of Walton, or the London Polyglot. It contains the same books as are contained in the common editions of the Bible, with the Apocrypha; that is, all those which are in the Polyglots before mentioned, except the third book of Maccabees. It contains, with the exception just mentioned, all in the preceding Polyglots, together with an Æthiopic version of the book of Psalms; (so nearly akin to the Septuagint, that the same Latin translation serves for both, with only a few exceptions, which are noted in the margin;) a twofold Hebrew text of the book of Tobit, one from P. Fagius, and another from Seb. Munster; the Syriac and Arabic versions of some books; the Greek of the first Apocryphal book of Esdras; three Targums of the Pentateuch, published in the fourth volume at the end of the Apocrypha, two in Chaldee, and one in Persic; the Persic version of the gospels; and the Æthiopic of the New Testament: all the above with their Latin translations. The sixth volume is made up of various readings and critical remarks on all the preceding versions. The Polyglot is enriched with prefaces, prolegomena, treatises on weights and measures, geographical charts, and chronological tables.

The editor of this Polyglot was Dr. Brian Walton. Having lost his benefices at the time of the revolution, he retired to Oxford, and devoted himself to this work. In this he was patronized by the Protector and his council. He received from them permission to import paper free of duty, and probably a grant of one thousand pounds in addition.* It is said to have been the first work ever printed by subscription in England. In 1652 Walton issued his proposals, having already received four thousand pounds by private subscription. The price of the work was fixed at ten pounds; one fifth of which was to be paid immediately, and the remainder at intervals of six months. For fifty pounds six copies were to be received. Those who, by any considerable gift or otherwise, should further the work, besides copies to be given them, were to be publicly acknowl-

* See [Clarke's] *Bibliographical Dictionary*, vol. ii. p. 8.

edged as its patrons and promoters. The work was not to be begun till enough was paid to finish the first volume, the Pentateuch, whose expense was computed at fifteen hundred pounds; nor the other volumes till a proportional sum for each should be brought in, viz. twelve hundred pounds.* In 1653 the printing was begun, and finished in 1657. A general preface was then prefixed, in which Walton expresses his gratitude to Cromwell and his council for the favor of importing paper free of duty. In 1660 the king was restored; and Walton printed a new edition of the two last leaves of his preface, in which the respectful mention of Cromwell and his council is struck out, there being a mere indefinite reference in a parenthesis to some by whose favor he had been relieved from the duty abovementioned; and some additions are made of complaints and invectives against the republicans. The copies of the Polyglot, which contain this latter preface, are called *loyal* copies; those which contain the former *republican*. The latter are very scarce, most subscribers having probably retained their copies unbound till the time of the restoration, and then choosing to have the loyal preface bound up with them. The detection of the differences between these last leaves of the two prefaces has excited considerable interest, as one of the minor objects of literary curiosity. In some, though a very few copies, there is likewise found a dedication to Charles II. For these alterations, for his former loyalty, and his literary labors too conspicuous to be unnoticed, Walton at the restoration received his reward, being first made chaplain to the king, and very soon afterwards bishop of Chester. This reward however he enjoyed but a very short time. He was consecrated bishop in December 1660, and died November 1661.

Of this Polyglot, there have long been three copies in the library of Harvard College, two of which are particularly curious and valuable; one of them as being one of the *republican* copies before mentioned; and another from several circumstances. This latter is one, for which, among many other books, the library is indebted to the liberality of the younger Thomas Hollis, a man who will always be remembered at Harvard

* See Clarke's Bibliographical Dictionary, where the original proposals are reprinted.

College with respect and gratitude. It is a very splendid copy on large paper, in which size there is a tradition according to the Bibliographers that only twelve were struck off. With an imperfect copy of Castell's Lexicon, (hereafter to be mentioned,) it is bound in thirteen volumes folio. It contains the dedication to Charles II, which is extant in so few copies, that its existence in any has been confidently denied.* This copy has likewise additional value and curiosity, from its having been formerly in the library of the earl of Clarendon, being a present to him from Walton himself, as appears from the following notice, written by Hollis on one of the blank leaves; "Thomas Hollis, an Englishman, a lover of liberty civil and religious, is desirous to present this set of books, a gift originally of the author of it to Edward Hyde, earl of Clarendon, chancellor of England, to the public library of Harvard College at Cambridge, in New England." Dated "Pall Mall, August 12, 1764."

The other copy of the work is at present deposited in the reading-room of the theological students, which was mentioned in the last number of the Repository.

This Polyglot should always be accompanied by the Heptaglot Lexicon of Castell, in which the Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, Samaritan, Æthiopic, and Arabic languages are explained in connexion, and the Persic by itself. This Lexicon was published in 1669 in two volumes folio. Its original price was forty shillings per volume in sheets.† It was a work of immense labor. In its compilation Castell was assisted by different learned men, but particularly by Dr. Lightfoot. He was employed in this Lexicon and in assisting Walton in editing his Polyglot for more than seventeen years; during which years he says of himself in his Dedication to Charles II, "I thought that day an holiday and a day of idleness, in which I did not spend sixteen or eighteen hours in laboring upon the Polyglot

* The controversy we see by the last British publications has just been settled in England, by the republishing of this dedication by itself, taken, it is said, from a copy of the Polyglot lately imported.

† Bibliographical Dictionary. This work and Castell's Dedication and Preface are the principle authorities in the following account.

or Lexicon.* During a part of this time he likewise maintained in his own house at his own cost seven Englishmen and seven foreigners as his assistants, who all died before the completion of the work. He expended twelve thousand pounds of his own property, and was obliged to borrow eighteen hundred, which being unable to repay, he was reduced to temporary distress. He lost many of his papers, much of his furniture and library, and three hundred copies of his Lexicon in the great fire at London.* He says in his dedicatory epistle just quoted, that his body was broken by infirmity, and what more than all distressed him, his eyesight was almost destroyed by continual watchings. In his preface he says, "being now for some time advanced in years, my patrimony gone, the powers of my mind exhausted, my eyes dim, having had my limbs at different times broken and dislocated, I am left alone, without any amanuensis or corrector of the press, so that I hope I shall be pardoned by candid readers for any errors, if any should be found." Being unable to repay the money, which he had borrowed, he was constrained during the progress of his work, to make application to Charles II, and to entreat him, "that a prison might not be the recompense of so much labor and expense." But it was hardly to be expected that the merits of Castell should be properly estimated by

* Annus jam agitur decimus septimus, ex quo relicto rure paterno immanibus hisce atque tremendis ausis (talía fuerunt certe), non sine M. T. consensu quum primum specimen hujus operis sub ejus initium ad oculos fuit positum; necnon literis insuper quam plurimis a viris magni nominis, qua in ecclesia qua in republica domi forisque ad me missis (quarum magna pars uti etiam bibliothecæ, cum multa supellectile et tricenis Lexici Heptaglotti exemplaribus in flammis periit Londinensibus), me submissi invitum admodum, animoque (quod testabitur *ὁ κατὰ δεινότητάς*) multum horrescente, quodq; satis superque noverunt illi omnes summi viri, qui me promissis tum adjilii tum remunerationis ad isthæc non pellexerunt tantum, sed vi quadam urgender impulerunt. Mihi vero in Molendino hoc per tot annorum lustra indesinenter occupato, dies ille tanquam festus et otiosus visus est, in quo tam Bibliis Polyglottis, quam Lexicis hisce provehendis sexdecim aut octodecim horas dietim non insudavi. Mitto privata quæ corpori in curriculo hujus operis contigerant mala, membrorum confractiones, luxationes, contusiones, quodque præ omnibus hisce gravissime dolet, oculorum lumen, perpetuis atque indefessis vigiliis tantum non ademptum. Epist. Ded. ad Carolum II.

by the "loose and ribald court" of Charles II. His application produced a letter from the king to the principal clergy and nobility, recommending the work, and soliciting assistance for the author. This was followed some time after by one from the Archbishop of Canterbury, addressed to all the clergy. There were letters of a similar kind likewise signed by twenty nine English and Irish prelates. All that was obtained however by these letters was about seven hundred pounds; and of this, four hundred were collected by the bishop of Salisbury alone in fourteen days. The circular letter of Charles seems to have been the principal act of patronage which Castell received from the king, except the being made his chaplain. He held two small livings, and was made Professor of Arabic at Cambridge, and Prebendary of Canterbury. He died in 1685, aged seventy nine. Notwithstanding his misfortunes, and the neglect of his merits, it would not be wise to consider as unhappy the life of a man, who for seventeen years found an occupation in which he was so strongly interested, who knew that his labors were useful, and that his name would be remembered with honor.

Of the Lexicon of Castell, there are two copies in the library of Harvard College, besides the imperfect one before mentioned, which is on large paper, and which, if complete, would make the fourth copy on large paper, which is known to be in existence.

POETRY.

[The friend and correspondent, from whom were received the two following pieces, and from whom we hope to receive future favors of the same kind, will pardon the very trifling alterations made by the Editor.]

"Lenior et melior se, accedente senectute"

Now youth and its thoughtlessness hasten away;
 Its careless enjoyments no longer will stay:
 Its feelings were ardent, and hopes undefined,
 Elastic its thoughts, its affections were kind.

But now, by their influence moulding the soul,
 No more they retain their delightful control,
 No more hovering round me those visions appear,
 That pictured the future unsullied and clear—
 Made glory unsought in my path-way abound,
 And every exertion successfully crowned,
 While true was each smile, each profession sincere,
 And nought like applause to my bosom was dear.
 Nor thought I, that age which so promising seemed
 Would ever the season of sorrow be deemed;
 For yet was untasted affliction and care,
 The past was forgotten, the future was fair.
 But gone are the feelings of youthful delight,
 Departed the visions deceitful and bright.
 Yet passing, they o'er me their influence shed,
 And fruit now remains though its promise is dead.
 Thus vanish the blossoms that Spring may display,
 The hope of the season, the joy of a day.
 But though disappointment has sobered my view,
 And sometimes a wearisome path I pursue,
 When worn with disease, or with studious pain,
 The sighs of depression I cannot restrain—
 I would not exchange for the joys that are past,
 The pleasures mature that forever will last;
 The vigor of mind, the engagement of soul,
 Of feeling and thought the increasing control,
 And, my friend, thy regard, that confiding and kind,
 Has enlivened my prospects, my feelings refined,
 And has scattered the clouds that once darkened my day,
 By the cheering attentions affection can pay.

A.

TO MY FRIEND, * * * * *

Drive the frown from thy brow, from thine eye chase the tear,
 And again let thy smile mildly beaming appear;
 For the sighs of despondence thy bosom that heave.
 Only add to the sorrows they seek to relieve.
 O! wouldst thou that life should appear as to youth,
 When the vision of hope seemed the promise of truth,
 When each feeling exulting was quick with delight,
 And each thought of the future unclouded and bright—
 O! wouldst thou to thee such expectance were given,
 Enjoy it, 'tis thine, 'tis the prospect of heaven!

A.

O'er my grave be shed
The bitter tears of sinking age,
That mourns its cherished comforts dead,
With grief no human hopes assuage.

When through the still and gazing street,
My funeral winds its sad array,
Ne'er may a father's faltering feet
Lead with slow steps the churchyard way.

'Tis a dread sight—the sunken eye,
The look of calm and fixed despair,
And the pale lips that breathe no sigh,
But quiver with th' unuttered prayer.

Ne'er may a mother hide her tears,
As the mute circle spreads around,
Or turning from my grave, she hears
The clod fall fast with heavy sound.

Ne'er may she know the sinking heart,
The dreary loneliness of grief,
When all is o'er, when all depart,
And cease to yield their sad relief.

Nor entering in my vacant room,
Feel in its chill and heavy air,
As if the dampness of the tomb,
And spirits of the dead were there.

O welcome, though with care and pain,
The power to glad a parent's heart,
To bid a parent's joys remain,
And life's approaching ills depart.

TO * * * * ON THE DEATH OF A FRIEND.

By Andrews Norton

O STAY thy tears; for they are blest,
Whose days are passed, whose toil is done;
Here midnight care disturbs our rest,
Here sorrow dims the noon-day sun.

For laboring virtue's anxious toil,
For patient sorrow's stifled sigh,
For faith that marks the conqueror's spoil,
Heaven grants the recompense, to die.

How blest are they, whose transient years
Pass like an evening meteor's flight;
Not dark with guilt, nor dim with tears;
Whose course is short, unclouded, bright.

O cheerless were our lengthened way,
But heaven's own light dispels the gloom;
Streams downward from eternal day,
And casts a glory round the tomb.

Then stay thy tears; the blest above
Have hailed a spirit's heavenly birth;
Sung a new song of joy and love,
And why should anguish reign on earth?

REVIEW.

Nec vero hæc sine sorte datæ, sine judice, sedes.—VING.

ARTICLE 5.

1. *Bible News of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. In a series of letters, in four parts. 1. On the unity of God. 2. On the real divinity and glory of Christ. 3. On the character of the Holy Spirit. 4. An examination of difficult passages of Scripture. The whole addressed to a worthy minister of the gospel. By Noah Worcester, A. M. pastor of the church in Thornton. Concord, Hough. 1810. pp. 177.*
2. *Our Saviour's Divinity in primitive purity—a sermon on the Divine Sonship of Christ as the fundamental article of the Christian Faith. By Thomas Worcester, A. M. pastor of a church in Salisbury. Concord, Hough. July 1810. pp. 36.*
3. *An Impartial Review of Testimonies in favor of the Divinity of the Son of God, as given by the most eminent Christian bishops and martyrs of the three first centuries, and by the Council of Nice, A. D. 325. Also the origin of the doctrine of three persons in one God, extracted from Dr. Mosheim's "Ecclesiastical History," and confirmed by Dr. Milner's "History of the Church of Christ," in letters addressed to a worthy minister of the gospel. By Noah Worcester, A. M. Concord, Hough. August 1810. pp. 50.*
4. *Appeal to the Testimony of Christ, with respect to what dishonors him. A discourse on the testimony by which the Son of God honored his Father, and for which he endured the cross. By Thomas Worcester, A. M. Boston, Mallory & Co. 1810. pp. 28.*

5. *Call for Scripture evidence that Christ is the "self-existent eternal God."* A letter to Rev. Samuel Spring, D. D. By Thomas Worcester, A. M. Boston, for the Author, 1811. pp. 14.
6. *The Record, which God has given of his Son. A concise view of the glory of Christ, wholly in numerous, interwoven quotations from the Bible.* By Thomas Worcester. Concord, Hough. 1811. pp. 24.

THE question of the metaphysical nature of our Saviour is, we conceive, a matter of fact, not of speculation; and if decided at all, is to be decided from the evidence, which the scriptures furnish. As far as his nature differs from that of the beings of our own race, we can know it only by revelation, since to external appearance "he was found in fashion as a man." Reason therefore, we mean reason proceeding on abstract principles, can determine nothing affirmatively on this question, except in so far as enlightened reason is always necessary to aid us in the interpretation of the sacred writings. Since then this question must lie within so narrow a compass, it may appear to impeach very heavily the perspicuity of the records of our faith, that after eighteen hundred years have passed away, the Christian world, with these records always before them, are still found debating this point with undiminished eagerness; and that even at this late period a writer should come forward and announce that he has "news" to communicate, obtained exclusively from that source, from which all our knowledge on this subject is to proceed. But in this, as well as in all cases, we must guard against making Christianity responsible for the errors of its professors. The principle which we have stated, obvious and natural as it is, has been very greatly disregarded in the whole controversy on the doctrine of the Trinity. It is not pretended that this doctrine is formally laid down in any genuine piece of scripture; that is to say, that we are ever expressly called to believe in any, much less a triple division of the divine nature. It is a theory, which originally was produced by considerations, other than those, which the scriptures present; and seems now to be retained chiefly from the neces-

nities of the makers of theological systems, who do not attempt to defend it, as a matter of fact and direct revelation, but as indispensable to reconcile their views of certain passages of scripture with each other, and with their own metaphysical systems. If it could be detached from its connexion with the orthodox theories of infinite satisfaction, original corruption, &c. and were suffered to rest alone on the basis of the scripture evidence which supports it, we believe it is not too much to say, that it would hardly retain a single advocate, to whose authority any one would think of appealing on a question of scripture criticism.

The origin of the doctrine of the Trinity in the Christian church is easily accounted for, and has been often stated. In the period immediately succeeding the ascension of our Saviour, the subject does not appear to have been agitated at all, and no traces of the doctrine, as it is now received, are to be found in any writings of the apostolic age, which are not known to be spurious. But as the gospel extended itself, its advocates found themselves incommoded in their controversies with their unbelieving opposers, by the reproach, which was constantly cast upon them, that they were the followers of a crucified chief. The doctrine of Christ crucified was indeed always "a stumbling block to the Jews, and foolishness to the Greeks," and therefore it was, that even in the time of the apostle Paul, he found it necessary so frequently to remind his converts that it was a ground of glory, not of shame. To get rid of "the reproach of the cross," the first attempt was that of the Docetæ, who denied that Christ suffered in a real body; and to this heresy the apostle is supposed by some to allude, when he speaks of those, who denied that Christ had come in the flesh. Afterwards, as the converts from the pagan philosophy multiplied, they would naturally wish to bring over their friends to the same faith; and in order to make the transition as easy as possible, their representations of the gospel were studiously accommodated to their former philosophical theories. Hence, as in the speculations of Plato concerning the Deity, the term *Λόγος* (*Logos*) is sometimes found, and as it is thought also to be used in an unusual sense by the evangelist John as applied to our Saviour; the

followers of that philosopher, who appear however to have changed the ideas of their master,* found an occasion to suggest an analogy between Platonism and the gospel. The doctrine of the Trinity indeed was not completed in the form in which it is now received till far into the fourth century. But when we consider how much the genius of the age inclined to mysticism—that so portentous an absurdity as transubstantiation could be formed out of the simplest and most interesting of all rites—that the desire of reconciling the pagan prejudices to Christianity was carried so far as that some of the grossest idolatries of Rome were engrafted on the gospel system under new names, we shall wonder more at the respectable opposition with which the doctrine of the Trinity met, than that it was at last so firmly established.

That this doctrine, if it in truth have so little scripture evidence, should not have been rejected by the early Reformers of our religion, may excite some surprise. But indeed it would be unreasonable to expect that they, who did so much, should have been able to effect every thing. A man just emerging from a dungeon into the splendor of meridian day, must be supposed to have some disadvantages in the way of accurate observation. It would be too much to demand of men, who, however excellent, were certainly uninspired, that they should at once be able to throw off all the prejudices in which they had been educated, arrive at a perfect knowledge of scripture language, and settle at a single effort all the laws of scripture criticism. On the grand practical truths of the gospel we readily grant that they would not be likely to err; for thus we believe of every sincere and pious man, who looks into the scriptures with any thing of care and of seriousness. But with regard to the theory of theology, or in other words, to a systematic arrangement of the doctrines of the gospel, we must think they had many important disadvantages. To omit every other we may observe that they seem to have wholly neglected the great canon

* That there is nothing really similar to the doctrine of the Trinity in the writings of Plato himself, or even in those of the earliest of the later Platonists, is proved in the *Theological Repository*, vol. iv. p. 77—97, and 381—420.

of scripture interpretation;—that opinions should not be formed on any doctrine till after a cautious and regular induction from all the applicable passages of the sacred writings. The doctrines of the gospel, as every one knows, are not digested into formal propositions, nor even discussed and illustrated under distinct heads. The books of the New Testament are historical and epistolary. Many subjects are therefore touched on only partially and incidentally, and it is consequently necessary that various detached passages should be brought together and combined from all the books through which they are scattered, in order to observe in what respects they limit and qualify each other, and to have before us at one view all the materials for forming an accurate decision on the particular doctrines of the gospel, and a ground work for a just and comprehensive classification of the whole. This canon it is the sacred duty of every student of theology to observe at all times; but at the period of the Reformation it was wholly indispensable. It is evident that every doctrine, received through the church of Rome, had become justly doubtful and suspicious. There might be a *general* probability that some of the genuine principles of Christianity would be retained; but there was a *particular* presumption against each individual article. The gold appeared under the same false stamp of authority with the baser metal, and nothing ought to have restored confidence in its purity, but the application of the great and only test. There existed the same necessity in the science of theology, when received from the hands of the schoolmen, that *that* should be done, which it is the glory of Bacon and his followers to have accomplished in the other sciences, i. e. that all received theories should be abandoned; all scholastic and purely metaphysical speculations be rejected; every inquiry instituted anew; and no general conclusions drawn, not warranted by a slow and cautious and copious induction from the *statements of scripture* itself, and referrible to *them alone*, as their primary elements. But unhappily it was the genius of the age to theorize antecedently to examination and observation. The great obstacle to all knowledge in the time of Bacon, what he calls *scientiarum ad artes et methodos prematura reductio*, was felt also in the science of

theology. There was an eagerness to make systems and creeds on every subject. It was long before men would bring themselves to believe that on some subjects, where our views and our knowledge are necessarily limited and incomplete, it may be the truest as well as least presumptuous philosophy, *not to have any opinions at all.*

As then the genius of the age in which the Reformers lived, led them to make, what we may safely conclude is not indispensable should be made, since it was certainly not done by our Saviour and his apostles, namely, an immediate, systematic arrangement of the science of theology, we might expect that they would fall into some errors. That the doctrine of a triple division of the divine nature is found in the systems which they formed, is consequently a very slender proof that it must necessarily be found in the scriptures. As soon therefore as an increasing spirit of inquiry was diffused, and the shackles on the human mind removed, it was felt that it would be as wrong for us to acquiesce *implicitly* in the theories of the Reformers, as it would have been for them to have acquiesced in the opinions of the church of Rome. The grounds of the doctrine of the Trinity were accordingly examined with particular attention; and it has been its fate to be more doubted, the more it has been examined. From its connexion with church creeds and establishments, it has not been safe, till within the last half century, even in protestant countries, to inquire into this subject with freedom. Since that period the evidence has assumed quite a new aspect; and it may now well be doubted whether the believers of this doctrine have not lost the great test of orthodoxy,—numbers. Among those who pretend to fix any ideas to their words, nothing but confusion and uncertainty prevail; and it will hardly be denied that more now agree in the general fact of denying that the Trinity is a doctrine of scripture, than unite in any one of the various theories which affirm it. The truth is, that increasing light has poured in on this subject at every step of the investigation. It was long supposed that the testimony of early ecclesiastical antiquity was in favor of this doctrine. But now Mr. Worcester, with all the disadvantages of a want of access to the principal authorities on the sub-

ject, is yet able to show even from the citations of Milner and Mosheim themselves, both friends, and one the professed advocate of this doctrine, that the theory of the Trinity was not finally settled till far into the fourth century.* The most important illustrations however, which the subject has received, have been from the correction of the sacred text, and the more accurate study of its peculiar language. It has been found that of the very few passages, which appear to lend any direct evidence to the doctrine of the self-existent and eternal deity of Christ, several of the most important have been interpolated. This does something more than deprive its advocates of several of their strongest proof passages. It proves, that from the earliest times the want of scripture authority for it has been so much felt, that the evidence which could not be found has been attempted to be *made*.† Of the passages which remain,

* Impartial Review of testimonies, &c.

† How much this absence of scripture evidence is felt, is evinced by the eagerness with which Mr. Sharp's rule with regard to the Greek article was embraced, which appeared to drag a few more texts into the service of the advocates of the Trinity. A work by Dr. Middleton, of great and imposing learning, has appeared within a few years, in which the general theory of the article is examined at great length. He appears to think that his investigations have strengthened the rule; but, as it has been clearly shown by a most acute and able critic, they do in fact completely overthrow it. Mr. Sharp's rule can have no cogency, unless it be shown to be absolutely *inviolable* within the limits which he has prescribed to it. Dr. Middleton has shown, that within all these limits, there are many cases where the rule does not apply; and admits that it must be set aside, when there is an absolute incompatibility between what, under this rule, would appear to be attributed to the same subject. Such an incompatibility we contend exists between *Sees*, when taken literally and understood to be significant of nature and essence, and the other attributives in Ephes. v. 5. Tit. ii. 13. 2 Pet. i. 1, &c. when applied to our Saviour. On principles of mere reason, we suppose every one would allow that there can be no greater incompatibility than between the divine and the human nature, or *four distinct persons and two different natures* existing in one and the same being. Dr. Middleton has also shaken Mr. Sharp's rule in another important particular. By one of Mr. Sharp's own limitations he has made his rule inapplicable to *proper names*. Now Dr. Middleton admits that "during the life of our Saviour, *Xristos* had become a proper name;" that "*αυτος* so far partakes of the nature of proper names, that it sometimes

it may be safely affirmed, that after the application of the most obvious laws of interpretation to them, they are incomparably less numerous and less cogent than those which may be brought to support the doctrine of transubstantiation. What a basis to build a doctrine upon, which seems so vitally to affect the great truth of the unity of God!

The discussion of this controversy in our own country has hitherto been chiefly confined to private circles. Mr. Sherman a few years since gave to the world a book of much acuteness and some research, though prepared with too much haste to have all the accuracy which the subject demands. The work which we are now to examine has, we think, claims to be considered the most valuable which has yet been produced among us. Its value does not however arise from the absolute amount of the argument which is added, so much as from the circumstances under which it appears. It is the result of a retired clergyman's speculations, educated in "the strictest sect" of orthodoxy, with all his prejudices and all his temporal interests urging him to acquiesce in the opinions he had been taught; with no knowledge of the great names which have appeared against his former opinions, and no aid in his researches but the common English version of the Bible. He professes to have brought to the inquiry nothing of the learning which his predecessors have expended upon it. His doubts on the received doctrine of the Trinity appear to have all grown out of his own mind, and to have been resolved by the study of the scriptures alone. His account of their origin is interesting;

"dispenses with the article, where other words require it," and that "the same, or nearly the same is true of *the*." He has thus rendered it very doubtful whether there be, if he has not made it clear that there is not, any word left in the New Testament, to which Mr. Sharp can apply his rule, so as to make it support the theological tenet of our Saviour's divinity, except the word *eternus*. Even this word Dr. Middleton's unrelenting critic shows has great claims to the privilege of making similar approaches to a proper name, and thus the applicability of Mr. Sharp's rule is wholly destroyed. For the illustration and defence of these criticisms, we beg leave to refer our readers to the *Monthly Review* for June, 1810.

"From my infancy, I was taught to believe the Athanasian doctrine of three distinct, co-equal, and co-eternal Persons in one God. And I do not recollect that I had any doubts of its correctness, until several years after I began the work of the ministry. Believing it to be both true and important, according to my ability I taught it to others.—But even while I believed and taught the doctrine, I was often embarrassed by it both in prayer and in preaching. In giving thanks to God for his astonishing love in giving his SON to die for our offences, the theory has occurred with a *chilling* and *confounding* influence. These thoughts would unavoidably rush into my mind—God and his SON are one and the selfsame Being; the SON could not in *reality* die or suffer any more than the FATHER; it was only a mere man that suffered, to whom the SON was mysteriously united. In my preaching, while expressing the love of God in *SPARING NOT HIS OWN SON*, the same theory and the same train of thoughts would occur; and in some instances, both in prayer and in preaching, the influence of these thoughts has been so great, as for a time to obstruct my utterance." pp. 3, 4.

There are two points of view in which Mr. Worcester's book may be considered; first, as a statement of the argument against the doctrine of the Trinity; and secondly, as a theory of the metaphysical nature of Christ. We shall endeavour to arrange the observations we have to make on it under these two heads.

1. He begins with examining the meaning of the proposition, which the trinitarian calls on us to believe: that there are *three distinct, co-equal, co-eternal Persons in one God*. In his first letter he offers some very forcible remarks on the confusion and diversity of sentiment, which prevail among its advocates on this subject. The second is employed in defining and illustrating the meaning of the word 'person,' as it is used in the scriptures and in common discourse. "Until we understand the term, *Person*," he remarks, "we know not what is affirmed in the proposition. And if there be no definite meaning to the term, he who states the proposition, either affirms nothing, or he affirms he knows not what." p. 16. Mr. Worcester shows with a force of reasoning, with which we think every fair mind must be impressed, that the term 'person' always includes in it the idea of an *intelligent being*, and consequently that the trinitarian proposition affirms either a contra-

diction or a plurality of gods. A great deal is compressed in the two following paragraphs:

"As you, Sir, profess to believe that the Father and the Son are two Persons, and yet but one intelligent Being, I would ask whether the Father is not one intelligent Being? And is not the Son also an intelligent Being? Was he not an intelligent Being who came into the world to die for our sins? And was *he who came* and *he who sent him* one and the same intelligent Being?"

p. 14.

"Permit me now, Sir, to appeal from your theory to your enlightened common sense. Did you ever conceive of the Father and the Son as one and the same intelligent Being? When you thank God for the gift of his Son to die for us, do you not uniformly conceive of the Father as one intelligent Being, and of the Son as another? From my own past experience, I may presume, that, according to your common sense, the Father and the Son are as distinctly two intelligent Beings, as Abraham and Isaac. Of what importance then can it be to Christianity, to attempt to support a theory of personality, which is undefinable and ineffable, which does not accord with the common acceptance of the term Person, nor with the practical views even of those who adopt it? Scarcely any thing is more obvious to the common understanding of men, than what is usually intended by the word Person; but where the term is applied to the Godhead, they must be told that it means something, which cannot be explained. But if the explanation I have given of the meaning of the word Person shall be found to accord with the common sense of mankind, and with the practical views of Christians in relation to the Father and Son, may I not hope to escape the censure of those who profess *not to know* what is meant by Person as applied to the Godhead?" pp. 15, 16.

The third letter is devoted to the consideration of the argument for the Trinity from the use of some nouns, which are in a plural form in the Hebrew, but which are translated God in English; and also from the use of pronouns and verbs of the plural number, agreeing with the term God. Mr. Worcester professes to be unacquainted with the Hebrew language, and therefore dismisses the argument from the plural *nouns* with this one decisive remark, that if they prove any thing, they must go as far to prove a plurality of *Gods*, as a plurality of *self-existent persons*.* On the use of plural *pronouns*, *adjectives*

* On the use of the plural forms מַלְאֲכִים and מַלְאֲכֵי we beg leave to quote a few observations from the Critical Remarks of the trinitarian Goddes. "Do

tives, and *verbs* his reasoning is very acute and we believe in a great degree original. He thus retorts the argument of his opponents on themselves:

“ Let it now be supposed, that instead of *five or six plural pronouns* of doubtful relation, he had found *five or six thousand plural pronouns*, which obviously stand as substitutes for the names *God, Lord, or Jehovah*; would not his argument have been at least a thousand times more forcible than it is on the ground he has produced? Yea, let it be supposed that, on the most careful examination, he had found in the Bible only *five or six pronouns* for God of the *singular number*, and those too of doubtful import; and that, on the other hand, he had found *ALL* the pronouns for God, of the *plural number*, excepting the five or six doubtful instances; would not his argument have been invincible in favor of a plurality of Persons in the Godhead? Would any man of sense, after such an exhibition, ever have called in question the doctrine of three self-existent Persons? Confident I am, that such an argument would have had more weight in my mind than all the arguments I have seen or heard in favor of that doctrine.

“ Permit me then, Sir, to retort the argument from the use of

“ these words denote a plurality of persons when applied to the *One true God*?
 “ —No; not any more than אלהים and אלהי denote a plurality of *Lords*;
 “ אלהים and אלהי a plurality of *Creators*, פנים and פני a plurality of *faces*,
 “ or רוח a plurality of *lives*. It is truly strange that such an idea should have
 “ ever been entertained, and indeed it is only a modern notion, of the same age
 “ with scholastic theology. The Christian Fathers of the church, who were eager
 “ enough to discover in the Old Testament proofs of a Trinity never dream-
 “ ed of seeking one in אלהים.” C. R. p. 8. “ What! doth a term, which is
 “ equally applied to *Beelzebub* the god of Ekron, to *Chamos* the god of Moab, to
 “ *Molech* the god of the Ammonites; to the gods of Hamath, Arphad, Sepha-
 “ roaim, Eza, and Ava, denote the *everblessed Trinity*. Yet to all these obscene
 “ deities the word is applied by the Hebrew writers; a profanation hardly possi-
 “ ble, if the term itself contained the most profound and sacred mysteries; or in-
 “ deed any property or attribute peculiar to their own Great Jehovah, which
 “ latter term they never apply to any other god.—Again, if this word signify
 “ the three persons of the Godhead, how are we to explain רוח אלהים
 “ the *Spirit of God*? Why truly we must say that he is the spirit of himself!”
 C. R. p. 7. “ It has already been remarked that this term is not only applied to
 “ the true God; but to false gods, and even to a single false god, whether male
 “ or female, such as *Baal, Dagon, Ashtaroth*, &c. It is applied to one angel in
 “ Jud. xiii. 22. and to one man, *Moses*, Exod. iv. 16. and vii. 1. Nay, the gol-
 “ den calf is called by Aaron ‘*gods of gold*.’ The plural number is then no proof
 “ of a Trinity of Gods or Persons: and this is indeed allowed by the best com-
 “ mentators, whether Catholic or Protestant. See *Drusius’ Dissertation* on this
 “ word in 2 vol. of the *Sacred Critica*, part ii. p. 298.” C. R. p. 8.

pronouns and verbs in the Bible. Excepting those doubtful instances of *plural pronouns* mentioned by Mr. Jones, are not the pronouns for God *uniformly* of the *singular* number? Instead of *five or six* doubtful cases, do we not find *five or six thousand* instances in which *personal pronouns* of the *singular* number are unquestionably used as *substitutes* for the *nouns* GOD, LORD, or JEHOVAH?—And setting aside Mr. Jones' exceptions, do we not find the *verbs*, agreeing with the *noun* GOD, *uniformly* of the *singular* number?" pp. 19, 20.

His observations on the changes, which must be made in the language of the Bible in order to make it agree with the Athanasian doctrine are very ingenious and striking.

"Upon the same principle, the first commandment would read as follows:.... 'Thou shalt have no other gods before' us.

"When God said, 'I am God, and there is none like ME,' would not your theory have required the following form?.... 'WE ARE THE GOD, and there is none like us.'

"Would not the words of Christ, to have corresponded with your views, have stood thus?.... 'The God so loved the world, that THEY gave THEIR only begotten Son,' &c.

"The words of the scribe, 'There is one God, and there is none other but THEM,'—or but IT.

"A remarkable variation would also be requisite in the passage before quoted, in which God speaks of himself as the HOLY ONE. 'Thus saith the Lord, the HOLY ONE of Israel, and his Maker. Ask us of things to come, concerning OUR sons; and concerning the work of OUR hands, command ye us.'

"I would further suggest, whether another variation in this text would not render it still more conformable to Mr. Jones' scheme, and even to the language of Athanasians in general? 'Thus saith the Lord, the HOLY THREE of Israel!' This, I conceive, would have been a correct expression of your doctrine of the Trinity in Unity. Under the term LORD, or JEHOVAH, the *Unity* would have been implied; and under the terms HOLY THREE, the *Trinity* would have been expressed." p. 23.

Mr. Worcester's reasoning on the absurdity of the use of the word "person" is so irresistibly cogent, that we understand, that some of the Trinitarian divines among us, who have not been led to abandon the whole theory with which it is connected, have felt the necessity of avoiding its use in future. If however they should still continue to use the *personal pronouns* as before, and thereby *imply* as strongly as if they *affirmed* the existence of a triple personality in the divine

nature, it can only be considered as an evasion of an argument, which they feel they cannot answer.

The fourth is a short letter, which is occupied in showing that the Athanasian writers are insensibly led by the general tenor of the language of scripture, to speak of God as one person, when they are not professedly stating their peculiar opinions. He illustrates the inconsistencies into which they are thus led by quotations from Dr. Hopkins, Dr. Emmons, Dr. Spring, and Mr. Jones.

In the fifth letter, the idea of Mr. Jones, that the term God is a generic term, comprehending a plurality of persons of one common nature, is examined by our author, and shown to result in the most gross and absolute polytheism. The belief of all, who affix any meaning to the proposition of the Athanasians, must, we conceive, be ultimately resolved into this opinion, though Jones, we believe, is the only one who has ventured explicitly to state it.

With this letter is closed the first part of this work; the object of which is to establish this proposition—that the Supreme Being, or self-existent God, is *only* one person. In the second we have Mr. Worcester's own theory; but before we proceed to consider it, we wish to make a few more observations on the arguments which the book supplies in opposition to the received doctrine of the Trinity.

In several passages we are presented with some very forcible statements in illustration of the coincidence of Athanasianism, and the simplest form of Socinianism, with regard to the fact of the sufferings of the Saviour. We quote the following as an example:

“Writers and preachers on your side of the question do indeed often speak of the *abasement*, the *sufferings*, and *death*, of the Son of God, as though they believed these things to be affecting realities. But, after all, what is the amount of these representations, upon your hypothesis? You do not conceive that the Son of God became united to flesh and blood as the soul of Jesus Christ. So far from this, you suppose the Son of God *was* personally the self-existent God; and instead of becoming the soul of a human body, you suppose he became mysteriously united to a proper man, who, as distinct from the Son of God, had a true body and reasonable soul. And I think, Sir, it will be found,

that on this *Man* your theory lays the iniquity of us all;—that this *Man*, and not the SON of God, endured the stripes by which we have healing. For while you maintain that the SON was personally the only living and true God, you very consistently affirm that ‘he did not suffer in the least in his divine nature, but altogether in his human nature.’ And what is this but affirming that he did not suffer at all as the SON OF GOD, but only the *Man Jesus* suffered, to whom the SON was united? As, on the Athanasian hypothesis, the *Man Christ Jesus* and the *human nature* are the same, so the *Son*, or *self-existent God*, and the *divine nature* of Christ, are the same. You suppose the SON as incapable of suffering as the Father, and he did not in *reality* personally suffer on the cross any more than the Father did; nor any more than either of them suffered while Cranmer was burning at the stake. How then does it appear, that ‘GOD SPARED NOT HIS OWN SON?’

“You will probably plead, that the *Man Jesus* was united to the *person* of the SON of God, and that *person* suffered in his *human nature*. But, Sir, as you predicate personality on the SON or DIVINE NATURE, and do not allow personality to the *human nature*, it will, I suspect, be difficult for you to prove that *any person* suffered on the cross: for the sufferings fell simply on a *nature* to which you do not allow personality. As, in your view, the SON was the self-existent God, and could not suffer in his *Divine nature*, HE could not suffer in *any nature*. The man was only an appendage to his Person, mysteriously connected; and yet so far was the union from being very intimate or essential, that the *appendage* or the *Man* might suffer the severest agonies, and the SON or REAL PERSON be at the same time in a state of infinite felicity.” pp. 43, 44.

The sixth letter of the second part is, we think, one of the ablest in the book. It is not necessarily much connected with the peculiar opinions of the author. The subject is the representation of Christ in the form of God in Philipp. ii. 5—11. and though so much learning has been lavished upon it by so many writers, we doubt whether its hostility to the cause of Trinitarianism has ever been shown with equal clearness and force. We can hardly believe it possible, that any one should read this letter attentively without having his confidence in the doctrine of the Trinity shaken, at least so far as this, that he must feel that for any man to doubt it infers nothing against the rectitude either of his heart or his understanding.

We find throughout the remainder of this part many most ingenious statements and illustrations; but our lengthening col-

umns admonish us to forbear the attempt to exhibit or even to specify them.

In the third part we have a dissertation on the character of the Holy Spirit, and an examination of those passages of scripture, which are usually quoted by the Trinitarian writers. We every where find the traces of the same original and powerful understanding, and the same novelty and force of illustration, which we have before remarked. This is a part of his subject, where he would have received the most aid from the critical labors of his predecessors. But we are not sure that we are not better pleased with his book than if he had this aid. It is gratifying to see that the great cause of the absolute and essential Unity of God does not require the support of learned criticism to prove it from the scriptures; but that with all the disadvantage of reasoning from the English Bible alone, as given by trinitarian translators, the doctrine of a division of the divine nature can be so completely disproved.

II. But we must now hasten to consider Mr. Worcester's own ideas on the metaphysical nature of our Saviour. His theory is founded on the title "Son of God," so frequently and emphatically given to our Lord throughout the New Testament. He conceives that this title must import that "Christ" "is the Son of God in the most strict and proper sense of the terms," "as truly as Isaac was the son of Abraham;" p. 6.—that "he is not a *created*, intelligent Being; but a Being, who properly *derived* his existence and his nature from God;" p. 34.—"that he preexisted as the Son of God, or the Angel of God;" p. 71.—that he is not a *self-existent* Being; because "it is impossible that God should beget or produce a *self-existent* Son;" p. 46.—that "he is as truly the image of the invisible God, as Seth was the likeness of Adam;" p. 49.—that "he is therefore a person of divine dignity;" p. 54.—"*constituted* the *Creator* of the world;" p. 55.—"the Angel of God's presence, or the *Medium* by which God manifested himself to the Patriarchs;" p. 56.—"that he became the Son of Man by becoming the *soul* of a human body;" p. 68.—that "in union with a human body, he was truly a complex object, in which *two* natures were united in one person; that his character

"was officially complex by reason of the numerous offices" he sustained; p. 94.—and that he "is the object of divine honors;" p. 97. &c.

The application of the phrase 'Son of God,' to our Saviour has always excited attention. In order to avoid the obvious inference that he cannot be the very God himself, whose Son he is declared to be, the trinitarians have been accustomed to talk of an eternal and essential generation; an hypothesis, we must confess, which, whenever we have attempted to fix any ideas to it, has appeared not only to be destitute of any authority from scripture, but to involve a manifest contradiction. The inference against the self-existent and independent nature of the Saviour, to which the use of this phrase leads, is urged with great force by Mr. Worcester throughout his book. So far we entirely agree with him. But the idea of taking it in its strict and literal English import we acknowledge we are not prepared for. Our difficulties do not merely arise from the ideas to which the theory may seem to lead, concerning the divine nature. They arise likewise from an examination of the scripture phraseology relating to this subject; and the grounds of them we shall attempt briefly to state.

In order to establish his theory it is a necessary condition that Mr. Worcester should show, not only that this phrase *may* have the meaning which he affixes to it, but also that it *is* applied under such circumstances that it *cannot fairly be supposed to bear any other*. Now if we consider the manner, in which the words 'Son' and 'Son of God' are used in the scriptures, we shall find that so far from being necessarily restricted to the literal meaning, which they bear in our idiom, they are employed with the greatest latitude and variety of signification. The word 'Son,' both in Hebrew and in the New Testament Greek, is used to express a connexion between objects very diverse from that which exists between Father and Child. For example; "arrows," in the original Hebrew, are called "sons of the quiver," Lament. iii. 13. "Sparks" are called "children of the burning coals," Job v. 7. "My bond servant" is called "the son of my house," Gen. xv. 3. Wicked men are called "sons of Belial, or wickedness," 2 Sam. xxiii. 6.

Proud men, "children of pride," Job xli. 34. Those who are to inherit the kingdom are called "children of the kingdom," Matth. xiii. 38. Those whose affections are given to this world are called "children of this world," Luke xvi. 8. &c. &c. —The phrase 'Son of God' is of very frequent and various use in the scriptures. The angels are called "sons of God," Job. i. 6. ii. 1. The worshippers of God, or children of Seth, in distinction from the children of Cain, are called "sons of God," Gen. vi. 2. conf. iv. 26. The nation of the Jews have this title, Deut. xiv. 1. xxiii. 19. In Chronicles, God is repeatedly represented as saying of Solomon, that he shall be his son. See particularly 1 Chron. xxviii. 6. In general in the New Testament, observes Schleusner, every one is called a "son of God," who resembles Him, is particularly dear to Him, the object of his distinguished favor, and who discharges with fidelity the duties of piety and devotion to Him. This title is eminently applied to Christians in many places, Galat. iii. 26. 2 Cor. vi. 18. Matth. v. 9. Rom. viii. 14. &c.—It was a phrase in familiar use among the Jews, as applied to kings and magistrates, and those who were believed to hold the place of God among men, Ps. lxxxii. 6. lxxxix. 27, 28. xcvi. 7. Jerem. xxxi. 20. conf. John. x. 34—37.* Now before the application of this phrase can be brought to prove Mr. Worcester's theory, it must be shown that it is not given to our Saviour in any sense *analogous* to those which it bears in the passages we have cited, i. e. as expressive of his character and official dignity rather than his metaphysical nature. Mr. Worcester will find a remarkable illustration of the danger of pressing too closely the literal English import of idioms, so unlike our own in Luke iii. 38. where Adam is called the son of God in apparently the same sense as Seth is called the son of Adam. If Mr. Worcester could find a passage, which would make as much in his favor as this does against him, we should almost despair of convincing him that his inference from it might still be erroneous.

* On the use of this phrase we would make a general reference to Schleusner's Lexicon of the New Testament, voc. *deus*. Cocceius Lexicon et Comment. cura Schulz voc. *deus*; Watts, Questions concerning Jesus, works, vol. v. Simpson on the various characters and titles of Jesus Christ, Essay xiv.

We presume Mr. Worcester will be disposed to rely on the use of the term "only-begotten," which is applied to our Saviour five times by the apostle John, John i. 14, 18; iii. 16, 18; 1 John, iv. 9. But before we draw any argument from the literal English meaning of this term, we must remember that the same apostle, who applies this to our Saviour, says that his true disciples are also begotten of God, John i. 12.; 1 John v. 1.; James i. 18, and 1 Peter i. 3, 4. assert the same thing. Paul declares, Rom. viii. 29. that Christ was the first born *among many brethren*. These passages admonish us that this phrase may not be used in its primary and literal sense, and when we remember that the same word *μονογενής* (only-begotten) is applied to Isaac, though Abraham had another son, Ishmael, Heb. ii, 17.—that in Psalm xxii. 20, and xxxix. 17. the same word which is rendered "darling" in our version, is translated *μονογενής*, ("only-begotten") by the seventy, we may be led to think that it is only used to express that he is the object of the peculiar and preeminent favor and regard of the God and Father of us all.

It has been remarked, as if it were something of importance, that this phrase, "the Son of God," or, as it has been rendered, "the Son of the God," with the article prefixed to both nouns in the original (*ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ*) is applied to no one except our Saviour. If the article however be prefixed to one of these nouns, it must according to the idiom of the Greek language be prefixed to both; unless omitted before the former by some particular idiomatical exception; which omission does not affect the sense of the passage. There is no propriety therefore in translating (as has been done,) the above phrase into the English words "the Son of the God." The article before the latter noun is merely in conformity to the idiom of the language by which (as it is stated by Middleton in his work on the Greek article) if either of two correlatives or words in regimen with a mutual relation have the article, the other must have it likewise, unless it be omitted by some particular exception. We think it however evident that Jesus Christ is styled the Son of God in a higher and more emphatic sense, than any man or any angel, mentioned in the scriptures. In fact, there

is hardly any thing in the sacred writings, that we take to be more clear, than that a higher dignity, and larger communication of the Holy Spirit is given to Christ, than to any being, which they reveal to us; a dignity so high, and a communication so large, as to furnish a ground why we should honor the Son as we honor the Father, who sent him. But though we believe all this, we believe also with equal confidence, that there is not a single instance, where the phrase "Son of God" is applied to Christ, in which it is the design of the sacred writers to teach us any thing with regard to the essential and metaphysical nature of this glorious being.

We must now take our leave of Mr. Worcester. We do it with the most sincere respect for the ability, which his book every where displays. Its value as a contribution to the great cause of the perfect and essential unity of God, remains the same, whatever we may think of his theory of the nature of our Saviour. That value, in the present state of theological knowledge in our country, is perfectly inestimable. If he would allow us to make him a suggestion, we should request, that in his new edition, which we hear is already demanded, he would keep his reasonings against the Trinity as distinct as possible from those by which his own hypotheses are supported.

We have no room for any formal remarks on the other tracts, the titles of which are prefixed to this article. On the *Impartial Review*, by Mr. Noah Worcester, &c. we have already hazarded a passing opinion. The tracts, by Mr. Thomas Worcester, maintain the theory of his brother; and though sufficiently respectable do not add much to the general evidence, which supports it.

ARTICLE 6.

An Historical Sketch of the First Church in Boston, from its formation to the present period. To which are added two Sermons, one on leaving the old, and the other on entering the new house of worship. By the late Rev. William Emer-

son, *A. M. A. A. S. and S. H. S. the twelfth pastor of said church.* Boston; Munroe & Francis, 1812.

The following advertisement is prefixed to the book.

THE following work is published without material alterations, as it was left by the author.

It is to be regretted that he did not live to complete his design.

To what was prepared respecting Dr. Chauncy is added a sketch of his family by Dr. Clarke.*

As several of the author's late society have earnestly requested, that this history should contain some records of their two last beloved pastors, accounts of them have been added from documents, which have been already published.

The notice of Dr. Clarke is from the collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, vol. vi. p. 3. consisting of a "Sketch of the life and character of Rev. Dr. Clarke," supposed to be written by Rev. Dr. Belknap; and an extract from President Willard's discourse, delivered at First Church, the Sunday after the decease of Dr. Clarke.

The account of Mr. Emerson is extracted from the discourse, delivered at his funeral by Rev. Joseph S. Buckminster, minister of Brattle-street church.

To the whole are added, agreeably to the original design of the author, two sermons; one preached on leaving the old house of worship in Cornhill; the other, at the dedication of the new meeting-house in Chauncy-place.

THIS fragment of a work, on which the reverend and beloved author was long and fondly employed, and which he earnestly wished to live to finish, revives at every page our recollection of his habits of thought and expression. It is a chronological and historical sketch of the history of the church, over which he presided, and is a species of compilation for which he was extremely well qualified by his carefulness of inquiry and accuracy of statement. If indeed he had not proceeded in the work with such minute care and exactness he would probably have finished it before his death; but now the narration is brought by his own pen only to the year 1765. He was taken from his task while he was employed in analysing and reviewing the works of Dr. Chauncy, whose character he most profoundly venerated. It is not without emotion that we have read what the author says page 181, where he commences his

* Published in an appendix to his sermon on the death of Dr. Chauncy.

sketch of Chauncy's life.—“ It is with a *trembling* hand that “ I undertake to sketch the eminent and various merits of the “ late reverend and learned Dr. Chauncy. *That this article “ of biography should not have been finished, as it was begun, by “ the colleague, whom he elected and loved, my immediate prede- “ cessor, [Dr. Clarke,] I have ever considered a misfortune to the “ cause of letters and of rational Christianity.* It is vain how- “ ever to deplore irremediable evils. I shall now use the best “ means I can command, to supply this deficiency, and trust to “ the good will of my friends, and the superior diligence of my “ successors, to correct my mistakes.” We pass away like a *tale* that is told. *Mutato nomine, de te fabula narratur.*

We shall not undertake to criticise a work left so unfinished as the present. We will only observe, for the sake of those who imagine that such a history cannot be generally interesting and important, that the history of the First Church was, during many years, the history of the colony of Massachusetts. Never, perhaps, was there a civil and ecclesiastical union more intimate since the theocracy of the Jews, than that which existed here in the first days of New-English history. The magistrates were elected only by the members of the churches; the ministers assumed the privilege of advising and controlling their governors, and the general court, with or without the request of the ministers, often interfered in the affairs of the churches. The magistrates had no code of written laws, by which to govern themselves, and hence the Mosaic institutions, as interpreted and applied by the ministers, were often the dangerous guide, or justification of the civil authority. In this state of things the First Church in Boston gave law to the colony. It was honored with the presence of governor Winthrop, a name never to be mentioned *without* honor, of Dudley, Vane, Bel-lingham; and not only so, but Mr. Cotton their pastor governed the governors, and gave law at the Thursday lecture. Those who have read the history of that early period in Winthrop's Journal, will find all his facts, relating to the ecclesiastical history of the colony, re-stated by Mr. Emerson in a very plain and comprehensive manner. We are indeed extremely sorry that the reverend author has not given us his authorities fully

and carefully; and though we have no doubt of his fidelity and judgment, we should have been much better satisfied, if he had always signified to us the sources, from which he derived information; and particularly how much he was assisted by the manuscript records of the First Church. At present, however, we can only thank his executors for having given us this valuable though imperfect contribution to our ecclesiastical history, and earnestly hope that the extracts we shall give below will excite the curiosity of the public, and induce many to purchase for the sake of the widow, as well as for its own merits, this relic of the late pastor of the First Church.

The following is the original contract, the form of covenant, subscribed by the members of the First Church at its formation in 1630.

"In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in obedience to his holy will and divine ordinance,

"We, whose names are here underwritten, being by his most wise and good providence brought together into this part of America, in the Bay of Massachusetts, and desirous to unite into one congregation or church, under the Lord Jesus Christ, our head, in such sort, as becometh all those, whom he hath redeemed, and sanctified to himself, do hereby solemnly and religiously, as in his most holy presence, promise and bind ourselves to walk in all our ways according to the rule of the gospel, and in all sincere conformity to his holy ordinances, and in mutual love and respect to each other so near, as God shall give us grace." pp. 11, 12.

We next give the account of the origin of the Boston association of ministers in 1633.

"The ministers in the neighbourhood, having become sufficiently numerous, formed an association, and met, once a fortnight, in rotation, at one another's houses. At each meeting some subject of moment was debated. Mr. Skelton and Mr. Williams, of Salem, were offended at the rise of this institution, and predicted, that it would originate a presbytery, or superintendency, that would end in the ruin of the church's liberties. Mr. Hubbard, in his MS. indulges a bitterness of invective against these gentlemen, which the expression of their fears can hardly justify. The event however has proved, that their suspicions were groundless. What they condemned was the origin of the Boston Association of congregational ministers, who continue, every second Monday in the afternoon, to hold a meeting for prayer, theological discus-

sion, and social intercourse. Yet perhaps there is not a place in the world, where the independence of individual churches is more perfectly enjoyed, than in this metropolis, and its vicinity." pp. 20, 21.

The first notice of the Thursday lecture in Boston is, it seems, of its existence in the following year, 1634.

"The earliest notice of the 5th day or Thursday lecture is given in Winthrop's Journal for this year, when it seems to have been already established." p. 22.

On the fourth of October this year it was suspended every other Thursday to give place to another lecture at Cambridge. On the eleventh of December it reverted to its former order.

"It was customary for the inhabitants occasionally to transact business relative to the police of the town, immediately after lecture. On 11 December, this year, they chose seven new selectmen, to the exclusion of very worthy gentlemen, who had served them in preceding years. But Mr. Cotton interposed and showed from scripture, that it was an order of heaven to have all such business committed to the elders. Such was the weight of his authority, that he caused, on the succeeding Thursday, a new election." pp. 23, 24.

On one of the pages from which we have last quoted, is another anecdote of Mr. Cotton's preaching.

"On every occasion, where a matter was disputed, Mr. Cotton settled the difference by his public preaching. Mr. Hooker and his friends were about to remove to the Connecticut. Their design was strenuously seconded by some and opposed by others. After the matter had been for some time debated, Mr. Cotton ended the affair by preaching from Hag. ii. 4. showing the strength of the magistracy, ministry, and people. In their authority consisted the strength of the first, in their purity that of the second, and in their liberty that of the last. Each estate, he said, had a negative voice, and yet the ultimate power should reside in the whole body of the people." p. 23.

A good account is given pp. 28—60, of the antinomian controversy with Hutchinson and Wheelwright. It is too long to be here extracted.

The following is the account of the rebuilding the meeting-house of the First Church in 1639.

"Towards the close of the year 1689, the congregation meditated the rebuilding of their house of worship. The old one, which was erected in 1632, having become not only decayed, but also too small to accommodate the people, there was no question about the necessity of a new house, but a wide and warm difference of opinion respecting where it should stand. Some of the inhabitants were for placing it on what was then called the green, now probably common street, which was the governor's first lot. Others, particularly the tradesmen, were inclined to build it still nearer the market, than where the old one stood, which was near the spot now occupied by the northwest corner of the Exchange. Many words were expended in both talking and writing on the subject. Mr. Cotton, without whom neither ecclesiastical, civil, nor secular affairs apparently prospered, at length interfered. It was unsafe, in his opinion, to remove it to the green, as many persons had purchased and settled round the market, in the expectation of being accommodated, as in other things, so in their proximity to the place of worship. It was finally determined, with a good degree of harmony, to erect the new church on the plat, where the Old Brick lately stood, and which now is covered by the block of buildings in cornhill square. The contractors for the work calculated that it would cost 600*l*. They offered to take the old for half that sum, and the complement was to be supplied by voluntary contributions of the people. The church however cost about 1000*l*.; yet the expenses were defrayed without either murmurs or assessments." pp. 65, 66.

The account of Norton is too short. In our opinion, he was the most learned, powerful, and accomplished divine of that age. His *Responsio ad Apollonium* is a masterly specimen of reasoning in the manner of the schoolmen, and worthy of being read at the present day, as a defence of Congregationalism, and for the sake of the fine epistle in Latin, with which Cotton recommends it. Norton was a most rigid Calvinist, and his "Orthodox Evangelist" was for a long time a manual for the divines, which succeeded him. In another work, "Discussion of the sufferings of Christ," he lays down the *doctrine of imputation* with great distinctness; and at the end of the book was published an instrument, signed by Cotton, Wilson, Mather, Symmes and Tompson, in the name of the rest of the clergy, in which they declare, that, "as they believe, they do also" profess, that the obedience of Christ to the whole law is the "matter of our justification; and the imputation of our sins to Christ—and the imputation of his obedience and sufferings

"to us are the *formal cause* of our justification. And that they who DENY THIS, do now take away both of these, both the *"matter and form of our justification, which is the life of our souls and of our religion."* Alas! How would these holy men of God have groaned in spirit had they known that in less than a century and a half this "*articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ*" would have been controverted by the orthodox Evangelists of the present day, and entirely dispensed with in the creed of that theological institution, which is the form defenders of the primitive faith of New England! the faith once delivered to the saints! Norton's letter to Duræus does him more honor than his book against the quakers, which, though we have never seen, we fear is full of the maxims of orthodox and glorious persecution for the honor of God. On the treatment of the quakers, Cotton Mather says, in the words of Queen Elizabeth to the Lord President of Scotland on the subject of suppression of the papists, "*Nolo mortem peccatoris.*" The close of this great man's life was embittered by the ingratitude of his countrymen; and there is something truly affecting in the following account,

"To his other good qualities Mr. Norton joined an ardent and steady attachment to his adopted country. His patriotism led him to earnest and successful efforts to prevent hostilities between the people of this colony and their Dutch neighbours, and afterward to embark for England in company with Simon Bradstreet, Esq. with an address to Charles II, on his restoration to the throne. This embassy however, in its issue, was fatal to the popularity and peace of Mr. Norton. Having faithfully served the interests of the country, the agents returned with this assurance from the king, that he would ratify to the colony its charter. But along with this promise was a requisition, that justice should be administered in his name, and that all persons of sober conversation should be permitted to enjoy the ordinance of the supper themselves, and that of baptism for their children. Here was an infringement, as the people conceived, of their religious freedoms; and it was instantly reported, that the agents had sold the liberties of the country. Mr. Norton's consciousness of integrity was hardly able to sustain his share of an unmerited reproach. The chilling looks, which he received from countenances, once expressive of nothing but approbation and friendship, damped the ardor of his professional pursuits, and contributed, it is thought, to shorten his days. For, after his return, his wonderful talent

in extempore prayer was no longer admired; and the same sermons, which in other days were heard with a kind of ecstacy, now fell powerless on the ears of a languid auditory. It is traditioned, that even the venerable and benevolent Wilson was heard to say that he must have another colleague." pp. 97, 98.

We give the following extract to illustrate the spirit of the times in 1668.

"It was in this year, and with a view to the revival and diffusion of a spirit of piety, that an attempt was made to print an edition of Thomas a Kempis. The design however failed, through an apprehension in the general court, that the book, being written by a papist, might excite a relish for popish principles. Capt. Daniel Gookin and Rev. Jonathan Mitchel, who were licensers of the press, were accordingly ordered by the court to stop the progress of the work. What would be thought, at this day, of a legislature, which should forbid the publication of any one book of any one sect of Christians? Indeed a like degree of rigour at the same point of time, was not exercised in the parent country. But it had grown customary with men, who had fled the tyranny of the lord bishops to practise the tyranny of the lord brethren. Intolerance was the order of the day; and the government of each individual church was as eagle-eyed in discovering heresy, and sometimes as cruel in punishing it, as the Spanish inquisition.

"This truth was disgracefully manifest, about this period, in the sufferings of the baptists. At the very moment, when congregationalists were writhing beneath the lashes of persecution in England, they seemed determined in this country to retaliate vengeance on dissenters from them. This wicked conduct was neither unnoticed nor unproved. A letter was sent from London to the governor of Massachusetts, signed by Drs. Goodwin and Owen, Messrs. Nye and Caryl, and nine other ministers, entreating him to use his authority for releasing the baptists from prison, and rescuing them from the power of sanguinary laws. But this letter, though penned with moderation and gentleness, and containing the most touching appeals to the heart, made no impression on the congregationalists of Massachusetts. The baptists still groaned in prisons. The most unrighteous laws stared them in the face; and the most villanous conduct was secretly practised to their mischief.

"This treatment of the baptists was comparatively trivial to what the poor quakers endured. They were subjects of reproach, scorn, buffetting, scourges, torture, and death. They were stripped of the clothes they wore, and robbed of the beds whereon they lay. The vessels, in which they ate, were forced from them, and their food itself reduced almost to nothing. If any thing in

extenuation of this persecuting spirit may be alleged, it is the exceedingly irregular and extravagant behaviour of the sectaries, who kept no terms with decency, and strangely imagined, they were doing God service by violating the rules of good manners." pp. 108, 109.

What succeeds is of a different character, and shews how true our ancestors were to those principles respecting church government, which we now maintain.

"In the year 1679, there was a synod called by the general court, under an apprehension, that the sins of the land loudly cried for the vengeance of heaven. The aspect of public affairs was indeed portentous; yet there seem not to have been any uncommon marks of national degeneracy. The ministers however obeyed the summons of the civil authority, and placed at the head of their body Mr. John Sherman and Mr. Urian Oakes. The first question, to which their attention was called, was 'What are the sins, which have provoked the divine anger?' The second, 'What are the means of removing it?' The synod resulted, and communicated their result to the general court. It pointed out the sins of the times, and depicted in glowing colours the calamities of the country. In most churches the covenant was renewed, and in every church some notice was taken of the Reforming Synod, and of the measures it recommended, for reviving the power and spirit of religion.

"Some indeed questioned the sincerity of the leading men in the country, who were instrumental in convoking the synod. The gay and licentious court of Charles II could hardly believe, that there were men of piety enough in Newengland, who would take the pains, which were there taken to promote the practice of sound morality.

"First Church also did not see the propriety of calling this synod. Yet its leading members could not be accused of being inimical to the interests of truth and religion. On 5 August, the following vote was passed by the church:—

"Voted, upon an order of the general court, to send elders and messengers to a synod to meet, the 24th day in September. Though we do not see light for the calling of a synod at this time; yet, there being one called, that what good there is or may be encouraged, and evil prevented, by our testimony, we are willing to send out messengers to it, though, whatever is there determined, we look upon and judge to be no farther binding to us, than the light of God's words is thereby cleared to our consciences."

"In this vote is manifest the spirit of liberty, which prevailed in those days, and which now animates a large majority of the churches in this commonwealth. The members of First Church in particular were uniformly careful to guard the freedom of the

brethren against the encroachments of the civil authority. This assertion will be further evident by the subsequent vote, which was passed on the same occasion.

“ ‘ Voted by this church, 5 Aug. upon an order and advice of the magistrates, that all the elders of this town might jointly carry on the 5th day lecture.’ ”

“ ‘ In answer to the motion of the honored magistrates about the lecture; though, as an injunction, we cannot concur with it, but do humbly bear our witness against it, as apprehending it tending to the infringement of church liberty; yet, if the Lord incline the hearts of the other teaching officers of this town to accept the desire of our officers to give their assistance with those of this church, who shall be desired to carry on their fifth day lecture, we are willing to accept their help therein.’ ” pp. 127, 128, 129.

In 1712, the year following that in which the meeting house of the First Church had been burnt, while Bridge and Wadsworth were their clergymen, a very important innovation took place.

“ During their scattered condition, the church were not inattentive to the rules of ecclesiastical order, and the means of improvement. The liberal Christian will read with pleasure the subsequent extracts, and will probably discover in them the seeds of a liberality, which, in regard to the admission of church members, has ever since been spreading and maturing in the churches of Massachusetts.

“ ‘ At a church meeting, 29 Feb. 1711-12, the following proposals were voted at the school-house.

“ ‘ First Church in Boston proposed to the reverend elders,

“ ‘ That, when persons desire admission into the church, they be examined of the nature of a church, of the institution of ordinances and officers, of the authority and rule given by Christ to the elders, of the duty and privilege of the brotherhood.

“ ‘ This is to be summarily communicated to the church, together with the relation and belief of the party desiring admission.

“ ‘ That no objection be made to the receiving of any person professing faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, repentance of sin, and having a measure of scriptural knowledge of the order and government appointed by Christ in his church; although he have not the persuasion, which others passibly may profess, about some particulars, that are matter of dispute among learned, pious, and holy men.’ ” p. 162.

The following extract will give strangers a view of the kind

of union and the degree of independence, which exists among the churches of Boston.

“ The independence of congregational churches in Boston has been maintained from the beginning; and perhaps their freedom will best be preserved by keeping clear of entangling alliances. There is however a partial coalescence between churches, which rather promotes, than hinders the general objects of religious association. Some congregations, from local proximity, affinity of theological opinions, or other circumstances, are more likely to associate, than others; but such associations have no effect on the discipline or interior regulations of individual societies. Thus there is a certain indefinable union among all the congregational churches in the metropolis. Their ministers are united in holding an association at each other's houses every other Monday, in supporting a Theological Library,* in preaching a weekly lecture, and a quarterly charity lecture; and the several congregations tacitly agree in attending these lectures and favoring these institutions. The First Church is united with the Fourth, the Second with the Fifth, and the Sixth with the Seventh, in support of a monthly lecture, attended commonly on the Friday immediately preceding the Sunday on which is celebrated the Lord's Supper. The union for this purpose between the First and Fourth churches, commenced in the beginning of the year 1720. The lecture is attended in Brattle-street, and preached by the pastors of the two congregations alternately. There is indeed no express warrant for such an exercise in the Christian scriptures; and some have doubted the propriety of upholding the custom. They have alleged, that it tends to bring the ordinance of preaching into contempt with some, by making it too frequent, and that its effect is injurious to others, by inducing a belief, that some unusual, peculiar preparation is necessary for commemorating the death of our Saviour. But it ought to be remembered, that an attendance on this lecture is by no means considered an indispensable requisite for communion, on the following Sunday; and that any religious institution, which brings people voluntarily together, naturally expands the mind, and can hardly be unfavorable to the progress of charity. In the case just mentioned, the effect of the lecture has been happy. It has contributed to the harmony of both the ministers and brethren of the two societies.” pp. 167, 168, 169.

The account of Dr. Chauncy, one of the most eminent men our country has produced, and of his writings, as far as it is continued, is particularly interesting.

* This institution, which was founded, 1 June, 1807, invites however, and receives, subscriptions from both clergy and laity of all denominations.

We regret that the whole of Mr. Buckminster's funeral discourse on Mr. Emerson is not republished in this work. It had the very rare merit in such a discourse, that the praise of the dead was not extravagant; and the expressions of feeling in the living not overstrained; but both were rendered in a high degree impressive and affecting by their truth and nature.

The sermons of Mr. Emerson himself at the close of this little work are a favorable specimen of the author's pulpit compositions.

As it may be interesting to some of our readers, we here subjoin a list of the ministers of the First Church, which was founded 1630.

settled		died	settled		died
1630	Wilson	1667	1696	Wadsworth chos-	
1633	Cotton	1652	en Pres. Har. Col.	1725	
1656	Norton	1662	1705	Bridge	1715
1668	{ Davenport	1670	1717	Foxcroft	1769
	{ Allen	1710	1727	Chauncy	1787
1670	Oxenbridge	1674	1778	Clarke	1798
			1799	Emerson	1811

ARTICLE 7.

An account of Expeditions to the sources of the Mississippi, and through the western parts of Louisiana, to the sources of the Arkansaw, Kans, La Platte, and Pierre Jaun, Rivers; performed by order of the government of the United States during the years 1805, 1806, and 1807. And a Tour through the interior parts of New Spain, when conducted through these provinces, by order of the Captain-General, in the year 1807. By Major Z. M. Pike. Illustrated by Maps and Charts. Philadelphia, Conrad, & Co. 1810, 8vo.

THIS work is divided into three parts, with a large appendix to each. The first part contains a journal of the author's expedition to the sources of the Mississippi, in the years 1805 and 1806; the second part, a journal of an expedition, undertaken by him soon after his return from the former, into Lou-

isiana to the sources of the Arkansaw, &c.; and the third, a journal of what took place after his seizure by the government of New Mexico: he having unintentionally violated the Spanish territory by encamping on the Rio del Norte (North River), which he mistook for the Red River. The author at the time of his first expedition was a Lieutenant in the American service. He has since been successively promoted to higher ranks. The last, which we know of his attaining is that of Lt. Colonel. There is no finishing about this work, and no pretension to elegance. His journals are given apparently in their original form without selection.

"As a military man," says the author in his preface, "as a soldier from the time I was able to bear arms, it cannot be expected that a production of my pen can stand the test of criticism, and I hope by this candid appeal to the justice and indulgence of the learned, to induce them, to spare their censure, if they cannot award their praise." p. 5.

The publisher adds, that he "doubts whether any book ever went to press under so many disadvantages." Some passages indeed, from their perplexity and want of clearness, bear evident marks either of errors of the press or a want of the author's revision. The book however is valuable and interesting; and the more so from the air of genuineness and truth, which is given it by the very state in which it appears. All information, especially, concerning our new acquired territory of Louisiana, of which we know so little, is deserving attention. We shall proceed to give an abstract of the journals, and to notice those parts of these and of the appendix to each, which will be most generally interesting. The instructions to Lt. Pike concerning his first expedition are not given; and it is only incidentally that we learn its particular objects.

On the ninth of August, 1805, the exploring party under his command, consisting of one sergeant, two corporals, and seventeen privates, left their encampment near St. Louis, in a keel boat seventy feet long, with provisions for four months; principally, as appears, for the purpose of making a survey of the river Mississippi from that place to its source. St. Louis is situated on the west side of the Mississippi, a little below where the Missouri empties into that river. They proceeded for

about a month without any very remarkable occurrence. They passed different villages and encampments of the Indians, first of the Sacs, and higher up of the Reynards. About one hundred and fifty miles above the Missouri they arrived at the house of a French settler. He was married to a woman of the Sac nation and supported himself by a little cultivation and the Indian trade.* About two hundred and thirty miles from the Missouri, is a village of the Sacs; and the party were here met with assistance by Mr. William Ewing, an agent of the United States residing in this place to instruct that nation in agriculture. This establishment is in latitude $30^{\circ} 32'$ north. About two hundred and fifty miles above, they arrived at the settlement of a M. Dubuque, the proprietor of certain lead mines on the west side of the Mississippi, concerning which Lt. Pike had directions to make inquiry. Of these it seems by a paper in the appendix, that M. Dubuque had procured a grant from the Indians, which was afterward confirmed by the Spanish government. The quantity of lead obtained annually was from 20000 to 40000 pounds: the ore yielding seventy five per cent of metal. From M. Dubuque, Lt. Pike obtained information, that war was still carrying on between the two principal tribes of Indians on the river, the Sioux and Sauteurs.†

On the fourth of September the party arrived at the Prairie des Chiens, a small village situated on the east side of the Mississippi, where the Ouisconsin flows into it, in latitude $43^{\circ} 28'$ north. The Mississippi is here about half a mile wide, and the Ouisconsin when full nine hundred yards. This river is the grand source of communication between the lakes and the Mississippi, there being a portage of only about two miles between this and Fox river, which communicates with lake Michigan. The present village of the Prairie des Chiens, was first settled in 1783. It is about a mile above where an old one

* See Appendix to P. I. p. 42.

† These are the French names; the Sioux are called in English Sacs, and in their own language Narcotah; the Sauteurs in English Chipeways, and in their own language Ouchipawah. There is some confusion produced in the journal by the use sometimes of the French, and sometimes of the English or Indian names of the tribes or chiefs of the natives.

was situated, which existed during the time the French were in possession of the country. It contains eighteen houses, and there are nineteen others in its vicinity. Almost all the traders residing here connect themselves with Indian women, so that nearly one half of the inhabitants under twenty years of age have the blood of the aborigines in their veins. This is the last stage of the traders from Michilimacina and other parts, previous to their launching into the savage wilderness. They again meet here in the spring on their return from their wintering grounds, accompanied by three or four hundred Indians, when they hold a fair; the one party disposes of remnants of goods, and the other of reserved peltries. Affrays and murders, as might be expected, used sometimes to take place. But since the American government has become known, and the sale of spirituous liquors to the Indians has been prohibited by it, such occurrences are less frequent.* At this place the party were received with attention and hospitality; and had a council with a small number of the Puants, and a chief of the lower band of the Sioux. Here likewise they exchanged their boat for others. On the eighth of September, a month after their first setting out, they left this place. On the tenth they were encamped in the morning, prevented from proceeding by the weather, when they received a message from La Feuille† a chief of the Sioux, the same whom they had met at the Prairie des Chiens. The following is the account of their reception by this chief and his men:—

“La Feuille sent down six of his young men to inform me, ‘that he had waited three days with meat, &c. but that last night they had began to drink, and that on the next day he would receive me with his people sober.’ I returned him for answer, ‘that the season was advanced, that time was pressing, and that if the rain ceased, I must go on.’ Mr. Frazer‡ and the interpreter went home with the Indians. We embarked about 1 o’clock. Frazer returning, informed me that the chief acquiesced in my reasons for pressing forward, but that he had prepared a pipe (by way of letter) to present me, to shew to all the Sioux above; with a message to inform them, that I was a chief

* Appendix to P. i. pp. 44—47. † He is called in Indian, Wabasha.

‡ A gentleman accompanying Lt. Pike from the Prairie des Chiens to the falls of St. Anthony.

of their new fathers, and that he wished me to be treated with friendship and respect. On our arrival opposite to the lodges, the men were paraded on the bank, with their guns in their hands. They saluted us (with ball) [the customary mode, it seems, among the Indians,] with what may be termed three rounds; which I returned with three rounds from each boat with my blunderbusses. This salute, although nothing to soldiers accustomed to fire, would not be so agreeable to many people; as the Indians had all been drinking, and as some of them even tried their dexterity, to see how near the boat they could strike. They may, indeed, be said to have struck on every side of us. When landed, I had my pistols in my belt and sword in hand. I was met on the bank by the chief, and invited to his lodge. As soon as my guards were formed, and sentinels posted, I accompanied him. Some of my men, who were going up with me, I caused to leave their arms behind, as a mark of confidence. At the chief's lodge, I found a clean mat and pillow, for me to sit on, and the beforementioned pipe on a pair of small crutches, before me. The chief sat on my right hand, my interpreter and Mr. Frazer on my left. After smoking, the chief spoke to the following purport: 'That, notwithstanding he had seen me at the prairie, he was happy to take me by the hand amongst his own people, and there to shew his young men the respect due to their *new father*: That, when at St. Louis, in the spring, his father had told him that if he looked down the river, he would see one of his young warriors coming up. He now found it true, and he was happy to see me, who knew the Great Spirit was the father of all; both the white and the red people; and if one died, the other could not live long. That he had never been at war with their *new father*, and hoped always to preserve the same good understanding that now existed. That he now presented me with a pipe, to show to the upper bands, a token of our good understanding; and that they might see his work, and imitate his conduct. That he had gone to St. Louis on a shameful visit, to carry a murderer; but that we had given the man his life, and he thanked us for it. That he had provided something to eat, but he supposed I could not eat it, and if not, to give it to my young men.' I replied: 'that, although I had told him at the prairie, my business up the Mississippi, I would again relate it to him. I then mentioned the different objects I had in view; with regard to the savages, who had fallen under our protection, by our late purchase from the Spaniards. The different posts to be established. The objects of these posts as related to them; supplying them with necessaries; having officers and agents of government near them, to attend to their business; and above all, to endeavour to make peace between the Sioux and Sauteurs. That if it was possible on my return I should bring some of the Sauteurs down with me, and take with me some of the Sioux chiefs to St. Louis; there to settle the long and bloody war,

which had existed between the two nations. That I accepted his pipe with pleasure, as the gift of a great man, and a brother. That it should be used as he desired.' I then eat of the dinner he had provided. It was very grateful. It was wild rye and venison, of which I sent four bowls to my men. I afterwards went to a dance, the performance of which was attended with many curious manœuvres. Men and women danced indiscriminately. They were all dressed in the gayest manner; each had in their hand, a small skin of some description, and would frequently run up, point their skin, and give a puff with their breath; when the person blown at, whether man or woman, would fall, and appear to be almost lifeless, or in great agony; but would recover slowly, rise, and join in the dance. This they called their great medicine; or, as I understood the word, dance of religion. The Indians believing that they actually puffed something into each other's bodies, which occasioned the falling, &c. It is not every person who is admitted; persons wishing to join them, must first make valuable presents to the society, to the amount of forty or fifty dollars, give a feast, and then are admitted with great ceremony. Mr. Frazer informed me, that he was once in a lodge with some young men, who did not belong to the club; when one of the dancers came in, they immediately threw their blankets over him, and forced him out of the lodge: he laughed, and the young Indians called him a fool, and said 'he did not know what the dancer might blow into his body.' " pp. 14, 15, 16, 17.

Carver in his seventh chapter gives a similar account of this dance, which he calls the Pawwaw or Black Dance. "The people of the colonies," he says, "tell a thousand ridiculous stories of the devil being raised in this dance by the Indians." Carver however himself says, "though I did not actually see the devil raised by it, I was witness to some scenes that could only be performed by such as dealt with him, or were very expert and dextrous jugglers." He likewise gives a particular account of the ceremonies of initiation into the society by which the dance is performed, called according to him, the Friendly Society of the Spirit.

On the twelfth September, they passed a prairie, where the Sioux had formed for themselves a somewhat singular mode of defence, which is thus described:—

"On this prairie Mr. Frazer shewed me some holes, dug by the Sioux, when in expectation of an attack, into which they first

put their women and children, and then crawl themselves. They were generally round, and about ten feet in diameter; but some were half moons, and quite a breastwork. This I understood was the chief work, which was the principal redoubt. Their modes of constructing them are, the moment they apprehend, or discover an enemy on a prairie, they commence digging with their knives, tomahawks, and a wooden ladle; and in an incredible short space of time, they have a hole sufficiently deep to cover themselves and their family from the balls or arrows of the enemy. They have no idea of taking those subterraneous redoubts by storm, as they would probably loose a great number of men in the attack; and although they might be successful in the event, it would be considered as a very imprudent action." p. 19.

The Indians, as is well known, seldom engage in open fight, but endeavour to obtain advantage by stratagem and concealment.

On the seventeenth, while upon that part of the river, which spreads itself out into lake Pepin, they were overtaken by a severe storm, and with some difficulty weathered a point, called Point de Sable. Here they found a Mr. Cameron, an Indian trader, and his men. The party exhibited the indolence of their mode of life. They had been laying here two days; his tents were pitched, and his canoes unloaded, and turned up for the habitation of his men. Here, says Lt. Pike,

"I was shewn a point of rocks from which a Sioux woman cast herself, and was dashed into a thousand pieces, on the rocks below. She had been informed, that her friends intended matching her to a man she despised; and having refused her the man she had chosen, she ascended the hill, singing her death song; and before they could overtake her, and obviate her purpose, she took the lover's leap! and ended her troubles, with her life." p. 22.

On the twenty-second they arrived at a village of the Sioux situated at the mouth of St. Peter's river, which flows into the Mississippi from the west about latitude 44° north. The Sioux had marched on a war excursion, but being informed by express of the arrival of the American party, immediately returned. Here on the next day a council was held between Lt. Pike and seven Indian chiefs; it is not said whether all of the Sioux nation or not. The principal objects of Lt. Pike's speech

were to obtain a grant of land at this place, the falls of St. Anthony, and another below at those of St. Croix, for the establishment of military posts and factories; and to induce them to make peace with the Sauteurs. His speech, which is given in the appendix, is really a very fine one. He admonishes them, if he should bring down any of the chiefs of the Sauteurs with him on his return, to respect his flag and protection; "for," he adds, "was a dog to run to my lodge for safety, his enemy "must walk over me to hurt him." The grants were obtained, one of a tract about nine miles square at the mouth of the St. Croix, and another surrounding the falls of St. Anthony; the privilege being reserved to the natives of hunting upon the land, and making any use of it which they had formerly done, not inconsistent with the purposes for which it was procured. For this grant they received from the United States two thousand dollars. Lt. Pike made them presents at the time to the amount of about two hundred dollars.

"The chiefs," says he, "were very loath to sign the articles relative to the land, asserting that their word of honor for the gift was sufficient, and that it was an impeachment of their probity to require them to bind themselves further, &c. &c. This is a small sample of their way of thinking." Letter to Gen. Wilkinson. Appendix to P. i. p. 11.

With regard to peace they spoke doubtfully, but promised a safe passport for any chief of the Sauteurs, who might be brought down.

Mr. Cameron, before-mentioned, had followed the American party, on his way to the village of St. Peters, and was present at this council, as was likewise Mr. Frazer. At this village Mr. Frazer was to remain. Here Lt. Pike exchanged with a Mr. Duncan one of his boats for a barge, which eight men were able to carry. On the twenty-seventh they began the portage, occasioned by the falls of St. Anthony. On this day two men arrived from Mr. Frazer, who was at St. Peters, for letters from Lt. Pike. "This business," he says, "of closing and sealing "appeared like a last adieu to the civilized world."

The party proceeded up the river. Some days after,

"I found," says Lt. Pike, "a small *red capot* [a sort of cloak]

hanging upon a tree; this my interpreter informed me was a sacrifice by some Indians to the *bon Dieu*;" [Great Spirit]. p. 31.

A few days after, he says,

"Near a war encampment, I found a painted buckskin and a piece of scarlet cloth, suspended by the limb of a tree; this I supposed to be a sacrifice to *Matcho Maniten* [the evil spirit], to render their enterprize successful." p. 32.

On the morning of the sixteenth of October, the ground was covered with snow, which had fallen during the night, and it still continued snowing. The party, if they went on, had to pass a rapid immediately above them, by wading to their necks in the water. Lt. Pike however having determined, if possible, to reach *la rivière de Corbeau* [Crow river,] the highest point ever made by the traders in their bark canoes, before the winter, an attempt was made to pass the rapids. After toiling however for four hours, when about two thirds of the way up the rapids, the party were too benumbed and exhausted to proceed, and were obliged to put ashore. It was then determined to return to their last station, and that a part of the men should be left there encamped, with the large boats, while another part with Lt. Pike, with two canoes, which were to be built, went on to the source of the river. Here the whole party remained till the ninth of December; building huts, enclosing them with a stockade, making the canoes and sledges for those who were to proceed, and hunting. This station was about two hundred and thirty three miles above the falls of St. Anthony. On the second of November Lt. Pike left the camp with Miller, one of his two hunters, for the purpose, if possible, of killing an elk, the signs of which, and of buffaloe had been numerous. He gives the following account:

"2d November, Saturday.—Left the camp with the fullest determination to kill an elk, if it were possible, before my return. I never had killed one of those animals. Took Miller, whose obliging disposition made him agreeable in the woods. I was determined that if we came on the trail of elk, to follow them a day or two in order to kill one. This, to a person acquainted with the nature of those animals, and the extent of the prairies in this country, would appear, what it really was, a very foolish resolution. We soon struck where a herd of one hundred and

fifty had passed. Pursued, and came in sight about eight o'clock; when they appeared, at a distance, like an army of Indians moving along in single file; a large buck, of at least four feet between the horns, leading the van, and one of equal magnitude bringing up the rear. We followed until near night, without once being able to get within point-blank shot. I once made Miller fire at them with his musket, at about four hundred yards distance: it had no other effect than to make them leave us about five miles behind on the prairie. Passed several deer in the course of the day, which I think we could have killed, but did not fire for fear of alarming the elk. Finding that it was no easy matter to kill one, I shot a doe through the body, as I perceived by her bleed, where she lay down in the snow; yet, not knowing how to track, we lost her. Shortly after saw three elk by themselves near a copse of woods. Approached near them, and broke the shoulder of one; but he ran off with the other two, just as I was about to follow. Saw a buck deer laying on the grass; shot him behind the eyes, when he fell over. I walked up to him, put my foot on his horns, and examined the shot; immediately after which he snorted, bounced up, and fell five steps from me. This I considered his last effort; but soon after, to our utter astonishment, he jumped up and ran off. He stopped frequently: we pursued him, expecting him to fall every minute, by which we were led from the pursuit of the wounded elk. After being wearied out in this unsuccessful chase, we returned in pursuit of the wounded elk; and when we came up to the party, found him missing from the flock. Shot another in the body; but my ball being small, he likewise escaped. Wounded another deer: when hungry, cold, and fatigued, after having wounded three deer and two elk, were obliged to encamp in a point of hemlock woods, on the head of Clear river. The large herd of elk lay about one mile from us, in the prairie. Our want of success I ascribe to the smallness of our balls, and to our inexperience in following the track, after wounding them; for it is very seldom a deer drops on the spot you shoot it.

"*2d November, Sunday.*—Rose pretty early, and went in pursuit of the elk. Wounded one buck deer on the way. We made an attempt to drive them into the woods, but their leader broke past us, and it appeared as if the drove would have followed him, though they had been obliged to run over us. We fired at them passing, but without effect. Pursued them through the swamp, till about ten o'clock; when I determined to attempt to make the river, and for that purpose took a due south course. Passed many droves of elk and buffalo, but being in the middle of an immense prairie, knew it was folly to attempt to shoot them. Wounded several deer, but got none. In fact, I knew I could shoot as many deer as any body; but neither myself nor company could find one in ten, whereas one experienced hunter would get all. Near night struck a lake about five miles long

much from the cold that day and night, and the next day; some of the men having different parts of their bodies frozen.

On the thirteenth of January, the whole party arrived at another establishment of the North West Company, on lake de Sable, or Sandy lake, in latitude $46^{\circ} 9' 20''$ north, where they were very hospitably received. The buildings are surrounded by a large stockade. Here Lt. Pike went out to survey the lake with Mr. Grant, who had likewise come up the river from the establishment below.

"On our march," he says, "we met an Indian coming into the fort; his countenance expressed no little astonishment, when told who I was and from whence I came; for the people in this country themselves acknowledge, that the savages hold in greater veneration the Americans, than any other white people. They say of us, when alluding to warlike achievements, that 'we are neither Frenchmen nor Englishmen, but white Indians.'" pp. 61, 62.

He had before observed in the course of his voyage, that the Indians on the river appeared to have a dread of Americans.

At this place the party eat roasted beaver flesh, dressed as a pig is usually, which was considered as excellent. The tail of a beaver it seems is thought a delicacy, as likewise the head of a moose, which in taste and substance very much resembles it. The men were here employed in making sleds (*traineaux de glace*) after the manner of the country; which are a single plank, turned up at one end like the head of a violin. The baggage is lashed on in bags and sacks. On the twentieth January they again commenced their march from this place. A few days after, Lt. Pike left his party, which it seems were to follow more slowly, and proceeded with his hunter, Miller, and an Indian, as a guide. After enduring various and severe hardships, on the first of February at half past two o'clock, he arrived at lake Sangaue, [Leech lake]. "I will not attempt," he says, "to describe my feelings on the accomplishment of 'my voyage; for this is the main source of the Mississippi." They crossed the lake, a distance of about twelve miles, to an establishment of the North West Company, where they arrived about ten o'clock in the evening, and were received with much attention by Mr. Hugh M'Gillis, the agent of that company in

this place. On the sixth, the remainder of the party arrived, having suffered much from the cold. The latitude of this place according to Lt. Pike is $47^{\circ} 16' 13''$ north. From this place Lt. Pike went, accompanied with Mr. M'Gillis, to the company's house on upper Red-cedar lake. Here he took the latitude, which he found to be $47^{\circ} 42' 40''$ north. Mr. Thompson, he mentions, in the year 1798 determined it to be $47^{\circ} 38'$, which he considered to be that of the source of the Mississippi. On his return from this place he says:—

“ We made the garrison about sundown, having been drawn at least ten miles in a sleigh, by two small dogs; who were loaded with two hundred pounds, and went so fast as to render it difficult, for the men with snow shoes, to keep up with them.” p. 69.

While at Leech lake Lt. Pike addressed a letter* to Mr. M'Gillis, in which he remonstrated against the British flag being hoisted in our territory, at this and at other establishments of the North West Company; and against that company's bringing goods into the country without paying the duties; and reminded him, that on these accounts the property at that place and elsewhere was liable to seizure and confiscation, informing him at the same time that he did not at that time intend to put the laws in execution, and was willing to sacrifice his prospect of private advantage. It appears from this letter, that one object of his expedition was to examine into the proceedings and trade of this company. Mr. M'Gillis in reply engaged to remove the British flag at that place, and to prevent its being hoisted in other establishments, as far as in his power; and to take measures, that goods should in future be entered and the duties paid at the custom house at Michilimacinae. He acknowledged likewise his obligations to Lt. Pike. The duties on goods, which might be entered at this custom house may be estimated, according to a statement in the appendix to this part, at about thirteen thousand dollars, and on all the goods brought into the country by this company at about twenty six thousand.†

On the sixteenth Lt. Pike held a council at this place with

* This letter and its answer are given in appendix to Part i.

† Appendix to Part i. p. 37.

the chiefs of the Sauteurs. The objects which he was desirous of obtaining were, that they should make peace with the Sioux; deliver up those medals and flags which they had received from the English traders; and that some of their chiefs should return with him to St. Louis. The traders, it seems from Lt. Pike's speech and the answers to it, give medals and flags as marks of favor and distinction; and even assume the authority of making chiefs. All the propositions were complied with; the chiefs smoked in the calumet of the Sioux chief La Feuille, that had been delivered to Lt. Pike, and which he had brought up, and promised to bury the hatchet. They gave him their pipes to be carried down to be smoked by the Sioux. It was however with some difficulty, that he was able to induce two of their young warriors to promise to accompany or follow him on his return: and these did not, as appears afterward, fulfil their engagement. On the nineteenth of February the party set out on their return.

"Mr. M'Gillis' hospitality," says Lt. Pike, "deserves to be particularly noticed; he presented me with his dogs and cariole, valued in this country at two hundred dollars; one of the dogs broke out of his harness, and we were not able during that day to catch him again; and the other poor fellow was obliged to pull the whole load, at least one hundred and fifty pounds." pp. 71, 72.

On the fifth of March, the party rejoined those, whom they had left at the fort constructed on their way up the river. At this place the whole party remained to the seventh of April. Here they were visited by two chiefs, who promised to be at peace with the Sauteurs, and each of whom gave his pipe to Lt. Pike for the Sauteur chiefs to smoke on their arrival. On this subject he a little after makes the following observations:

"If a subaltern with but twenty men, at so great a distance from the seat of his government, could effect so important a change in the minds of those savages, what might not a great and independent power effect, if instead of blowing up the flames of discord, they exerted their influence in the sacred cause of peace?" p. 79.

On the eighteenth of March he went to visit a Fols Avoine

chief, with whom he remained that day and night, and of whom he says:

"I must not here omit to mention an anecdote, which serves to characterize, more particularly, their manners."

"In the course of the day, observing a ring on one of my fingers, he inquired if it were gold; he was told it was the gift of one, with whom I should be happy to be at that time; he seemed to think seriously, and at night told my interpreter, 'That perhaps his father,' (as they all called me) 'felt much grieved for the want of a woman; if so he could furnish him with one.' He was answered that with us each man had but one wife, and that I considered it strictly my duty, to remain faithful to her. This he thought strange, (he himself having three)." p. 81.

On the twenty third, he visited a Shawonoe chief. Here in the evening he was entertained with the calumet and dog dances, also a dance whose name is not given. These dances are not here described. "The pipe or calumet dance," says Carver, "is the most pleasing to a spectator of any of the dances of the Indians: being the least frantic, and the movement of it most graceful. It is but on particular occasions that it is used; as when ambassadors from an enemy arrive to treat of peace, or when strangers of eminence pass through their territories." Lt. Pike adds that some of the men "struck the post, and told some of their war exploits." This, which he leaves without explanation, is likewise explained by Carver. The war dance, according to him, is commenced in a circle of warriors, by one of them singly, who dances, and at the same time sings his own exploits and those of his ancestors. When he has finished any memorable account, he gives a violent blow with his war club to a post, fixed in the centre of the assembly. This post, says Du Pratz,* is rudely formed in the shape of a man, (probably this is only occasionally the fact,) and intended to represent an enemy. This latter writer adds, what is very credible, that the warriors, heated by drinking, do not always strictly confine themselves to truth in their relations; but have the complaisance mutually to pass over each other's deviations from it. After each warrior has *struck the post* in succession, the dance becomes general. They dance, says Carver, with their knives

* In his *Histoire de la Louisiane* published in 3 vols, at Paris, 1758, tom. II: 485, 436.

in their hands, which they whirl about with violent motions, so that it requires incredible dexterity to escape being wounded. To heighten the scene, he adds, they set up the same hideous yells and cries, which they use in war; so that, as he remarks, with his usual naïveté, "it is impossible to consider them in any other light, than an assembly of demons."

"After the dance," adds Lt. Pike, "we had the feast of the dead (as it is called), at which each two or three were served with a pan or vessel full of meat, and when all were ready there was a prayer, after which the eating commenced; when it was expected we would eat up our portion entirely, being careful not to drop a bone, but to gather all up and put them in the dish. We were then treated with soup. After the eating was finished the chief again gave an exhortation, which finished the ceremony. I am told they then gather up all the fragments, and throw them in the water, lest the dogs should get them. Burning them is considered as sacrilegious. In this lodge were collected at one time forty-one persons great and small, (seventeen of whom were capable of bearing arms,) besides dogs without number." pp. 84, 85.

On the eleventh of April he arrived at the Sioux village at St. Peters, where he had a conference with forty chiefs of different bands of the Sioux, who all smoked out of the pipes of the Sauteurs, which he had brought down, except three, who were painted black, and were some of those who had lost their relations during the preceding winter.

On the twentieth of April he had another council with the Puants. On the same day he was present at one of the Indian games, which he thus describes.

"This afternoon they had a great game of the cross, on the prairie, between the Sioux on the one side, and the Puants and Reynards on the other. The ball is made of some hard substance and covered with leather, the cross sticks are round and net work, with handles of three feet long." The parties being ready, and bets agreed upon, (sometimes to the amount of some thousand dollars,) the goals are set up on the prairie at the distance of half a mile. The ball is thrown up in the middle, and each party strives to drive it to the opposite goal; and when either party

* Here it would seem from the obscurity of the sentence is some error. Carver says, "The ball sticks are about three feet long, at the end of which there is fixed a kind of racket resembling the palm of the hand, and fashioned of thongs cut from a deer skin."

gains the first rubber, which is driving it quick round the post, the ball is again taken to the centre, the ground changed, and the contest renewed; and this is continued until one side gains four times, which decides the bet. It is an interesting sight to see two or three hundred naked savages contending on the plain who shall bear off the palm of victory; as he who drives the ball round the goal is much shouted at by his companions. It sometimes happens that one catches the ball in his racket, and depending on his speed endeavours to carry it to the goal, and when he finds himself too closely pursued, he hurls it with great force and dexterity to an amazing distance, where there are always flankers of both parties ready to receive it; it seldom touches the ground, but is sometimes kept in the air for hours before either party can gain the victory." p. 100.

This game is described in a similar manner by Carver.

On the twenty eighth, they arrived at the house of the Frenchman, the passing of which in their voyage up has been mentioned. On the same day they stopped at some islands, about ten miles above Salt river, abounding in pigeons.

"In about fifteen minutes," says Lt. Pike, "my men had knocked on the head and brought on board two hundred and ninety eight. I had frequently heard of the fecundity of this bird, but never gave credit to what I then thought inclined to the marvellous; but really the most fervid imagination cannot conceive their numbers. Their noise in the woods was like the continued roaring of the wind, and the ground may be said to have been absolutely covered with their excrement. The young ones, which we killed, were nearly as large as the old, they could fly about ten steps, and were one mass of fat; their craws were filled with acorns and the wild pea. They were still reposing on their nests, which were merely small bunches of sticks joined, with which all the small trees were covered." p. 104.

On the thirtieth of April, after an absence of about nine months, and having sometimes endured great fatigue and hardship, the party arrived again at St. Louis; having in this voyage explored the Mississippi to its source, effected a peace between the Sioux and Sauteurs, done something toward bringing the trade of the North West Company under proper regulations, and likewise marked out several positions on the Mississippi as proper for military establishments. The peace however between the Sioux and the Sauteurs, Lt. Pike does not think will be of long continuance unless further measures are taken by our

government. Among the pieces in the appendix is one, from which we have quoted, containing "Observations on the soil, "shores, quarries, timber, islands, rapids, confluent streams, "highlands, prairies, the savages and settlements which I met "with on my voyage up the Mississippi, from St. Louis to its "source." Appendix to P. i. p. 41.

There is also in the appendix, a large table giving the numbers &c. of the Indians of the different tribes on the part of the Mississippi above St. Louis, and on its confluent streams, amounting in the whole, according to computation, to about eight thousand and thirty four warriors (among whom there are five thousand four hundred and fourteen fire arms) and thirty seven thousand and eighteen old men, women, and children—total forty five thousand one hundred and fifty two. Of these there are three thousand eight hundred and thirty five warriors of the Sioux, who have one thousand two hundred and sixty five fire arms; and two thousand and forty nine of the Sauteurs or Chipewaya, all of whom are supplied with fire arms. The Reynards have about four hundred warriors, all of them likewise with fire arms. This nation raises a great quantity of corn, beans, and melons: the former in such quantities as that they sell many hundred bushels per annum. The Sioux subsist principally by hunting. The Sauteurs are uncommonly attached to spirituous liquors: this is owing to their traders, who, according to Lt. Pike, "find it much to their interest to encourage their thirst after an article, which enables them to obtain "their peltries at so low a rate, as scarcely to be denominated "a consideration, and have reduced the people near the establishments to a degree of degradation unparalleled."*

The blood of the whites and of the natives is fast intermixing. There are twenty nine women belonging to the Fond du Lac department of the North West Company; all of whom are Indians; "there not being," says Lt. Pike, "a single white woman north west of lake Superior."†

* See Observations, &c. above-named, pp. 64, 65.

† Appendix to P. i. p. 40.

WE now proceed to Lt. Pike's expedition into Louisiana, which was commenced on the fifteenth of July 1806; about two months and an half after his return from the former. The whole party who set out on this expedition consisted of himself, Lt. Wilkinson, one surgeon, one sergeant, two corporals, sixteen privates, and an interpreter. Their primary object was to return to their country some chiefs of the Osage and Pawnees, who had been at Washington; and others of the former nation who had been redeemed from captivity among an hostile tribe; amounting in the whole to fifty one. For this purpose they were to proceed up the Missouri and Osage rivers (the latter being one of the branches of the former flowing from the southwest) to the Osage towns upon the latter. Lt. Pike was instructed after accomplishing this object, to effect, if possible, a permanent peace between different tribes, who were at war, and to bring with him some of their chiefs on his return, for the purpose of their proceeding to Washington. As this business would carry him near the sources of the Arkansaw and Red rivers, he was instructed, if circumstances were favorable, to detach one division of his party to descend the Arkansaw to the Mississippi and to return himself by way of the Red river. During the expedition he was to make all the observations in his power upon the country, its inhabitants, and productions. On the fifteenth of July the party began their ascent of the Missouri.

On the south of the Missouri not far from its mouth, there is an hill of coal, termed by the French, *La Charbonniere*. "This," says Lt. Pike, "is one solid stone hill, which probably affords sufficient fuel for all the population of Louisiana."^{*}

In his journal a few days after their setting out, he mentions the lamentations of the Indian mourners:

"Every morning we were awake by the mourning of the savages, who commenced crying about daylight, and continued for the space of an hour. I made inquiry of my interpreter with respect to this, who informed me that this was a custom not only with those who had recently lost their relatives, but also with others who recalled to mind the loss of some friend, dead long

^{*} See Appendix to P. ii. p. 1.

since, and joined the other mourners purely from sympathy. They appeared extremely affected, tears ran down their cheeks, and they sobbed bitterly; but in a moment they dry their cheeks and they cease their cries. Their songs of grief generally run thus: 'My dear father exists no longer: have pity on me, O Great Spirit! you see I cry forever; dry my tears and give me comfort.' The warriors songs are thus: 'Our enemies have slain my father (or mother); he is lost to me and his family; I pray to you, O Master of Life! to preserve me until I revenge his death, and then do with me as thou pleasest.' p. 115.

A similar account is given of the mourning of the Indians by Carver, in his fifteenth chapter.

The following anecdote, though trifling in itself, will throw light on the character of our natives, and tend to shew, that they are not quite so far in advance of civilized men, as some of their admirers have been disposed to place them:

"Previously to our embarkation," says Lt. Pike, "which took place at half past five o'clock, I was obliged to convince my red brethren that, if I protected them, I would not suffer them to plunder my men with impunity, for the chief had got one of my lads' tin cups attached to his baggage, and notwithstanding it was marked with the initials of the soldier's name, he refused to give it up. On which I requested the interpreter to tell him, 'that I had no idea that he had purloined the cup, but supposed some other person had attached it to his baggage; but that, knowing it to be my soldier's, I requested him to deliver it up, or I should be obliged to take other measures to obtain it.' This had the desired effect; for I certainly should have put my threats into execution from this principle, formed from my experience during my intercourse with Indians, *that if you have justice on your side, and do not enforce it, they universally despise you.*" p. 122.

The following however presents the Indians in a more favorable point of view. On the fifteenth of August in approaching the towns of the Osage, those who were returning with the American party were joined by their friends and relatives from the village, with horses to transport their baggage. Their meeting was very tender and affectionate:

"'Wives throwing themselves into the arms of their husbands, parents embracing their children, and children their parents, brothers and sisters meeting, one from captivity, the others from the towns—they, at the same time, returning thanks to the Good God for having brought them once more together.' " p. 124.

On the nineteenth of August, the whole party arrived at the towns of the Osage, called the Grand and Little, the latter being about six miles from the former. They are both on Osage river; and according to one of the maps connected with this work the larger is about in latitude 37° north and longitude $19^{\circ} 40'$ west, we presume from Philadelphia. A little below these towns the river bank is one solid bed of stone-coal. Here the party remained to the first of September. A council was held with the Osage, and with considerable difficulty four chiefs of the Grand Osage, and three Pawnees, agreed to accompany Lt. Pike to meet some of the Kanzas; it being one of the objects of his mission to effect a peace between these latter and the tribes of the Osage and Pawnees. A few horses were likewise with difficulty obtained, some by gift, some purchased, and some lent; though there were seven or eight hundred, according to Lt. Pike, belonging to the two towns.*

Besides these two towns on this river, the Osage have another settlement on the Arkansaw, which is more flourishing than the preceding. They raise large quantities of corn, beans, and pumpkins, which they manage with the greatest economy in order to make them last from year to year. All the agricultural labor is done by women. The dignity of chief is in most instances hereditary; but there are many, who attain more influence by their conduct in war, than others possess from their descent. In the chiefs the government is nominally vested; but they undertake nothing of importance, without assembling the warriors, and proposing the subject in council, to be discussed and decided on by a majority. They have no regular laws; but there is a tacit acknowledgement of the right which some have to command on certain occasions. The number of warriors is determined by Lt. Pike to be twelve hundred and fifty two, who have twelve hundred fire arms. The bulk of the nation are warriors and hunters; the remainder are divided into two classes, cooks and physicians, the latter of whom are likewise priests and magicians, and have great influence on the councils of the nation, by their pretended divinations, interpretations of dreams, and magical performances.

* Appendix to P. ii. p. 41.

According to the account given by Lt. Pike of some of their tricks, they rival in these the best educated jugglers of more civilized countries. The cooks are either for general use, or particularly attached to some great man. What is remarkable, distinguished warriors, when grown old, sometimes take up this profession. They likewise perform the duty of public criers. Nothing is said more than what is above, with regard to the religion of the Osage. The division into classes is in some degree peculiar to this nation.

The Pawnees in many respects resemble the Osage. Like them they are agricultural, and have a similar form of government. They have about two thousand warriors, and seven hundred fire arms.*

From these towns of the Osage the party marched to cross the country to a town of the Pawnees, situated near the northern branch of Kansas river, called the Republican fork. The Kansas river is one of the main branches of the Missouri, coming from the south west to unite with this river in about latitude 39° north, longitude 18° west, according to the map before mentioned. On the fourteenth of September, while on the banks of the Grand or White river, (it being uncertain which it should be considered,) they observed a great number of wild animals:

"On the march," says Lt. Pike, "we were continually passing through large herds of buffaloe, elk, and cabrie; and I have no doubt but one hunter could support two hundred men. I prevented the men shooting at the game, not merely because of the scarcity of ammunition, but, as I conceived, the laws of morality forbid it also." p. 187.

"But it is worthy of remark," he adds in his appendix, "that although the male buffaloe were in great abundance, yet in all our route from the Osage to the Pawnees we never saw one female. I acknowledge myself at a loss to determine, whether this is to be attributed to the decided preference the savages give to the meat of the female; and that consequently they are almost exterminated in the hunting grounds of the nations—or to some physical causes; for I afterwards discovered the females with young in such immense herds, as gave me no reason to believe, they yielded to the males in numbers." Appendix to P. ii. p. 5.

* See a Dissertation &c. in the Appendix to Part II, and likewise a Statistical abstract of the Indians, &c. in the same Appendix.

On the eighteenth of September, they passed a large branch of the Kansas, about twenty yards over, strongly impregnated with salt, sufficiently so as to salt the soup of the meat which was boiled in it.

Between Solomon's fork and the Republican fork of Kansas river, on the twenty sixth of September, the party were met at a Pawnee village by twelve Kaneses, who came, hearing that they were at that place; and on the twenty eighth, a council was held between the Kaneses and Osage, who smoked together the pipe of peace. On the next day, a great council was held with the Pawnees separately, at which not less than four hundred warriors were present. During the time of the council, the Spanish flag was flying at the door of the chief of the village. Against this Lt. Pike remonstrated, and it was delivered up to him. He however returned it to them, that they might not be embroiled in any quarrel with the Spaniards, if the latter should again make an incursion into the country, as they had lately done with a body of horse.

The American party had penetrated to the Republican fork, in latitude about $39^{\circ} 20'$ north, and longitude 25° west, according to the map before mentioned. Hence they returned in a southerly course on their way to the Arkansas. The Pawnees, through fear of, or attachment to, the Spaniards, (as it would seem,) wished to prevent their taking that direction, and even threatened to oppose force, which however was not done.

On the eighteenth of October they arrived at the Arkansas.

"The Arkansas river, taking its meanders agreeably to Lt. Wilkinson's survey of the lower part, is one thousand nine hundred and eighty one miles from its entrance into the Mississippi to the mountains, and from thence to its source one hundred and ninety two miles, making its total length two thousand one hundred and seventy three miles, all of which may be navigated with proper boats, constructed for the purpose; except the one hundred and ninety two miles in the mountains. It has emptying into it, several small rivers navigable for one hundred miles and upwards. Boats bound up the whole length of the navigation, should embark at its entrance, on the first of February; when they would have the fresh quite to the mountains, and meet with no detention. But if they should start later, they would find the river fifteen hundred miles up nearly dry. It has one singulari-

ty, which struck me very forcibly at first view, but on reflection, I am induced to believe it is the same case with all the rivers, which run through a low, dry, and sandy soil in warm climates. This I observed to be the case with the Rio del Norte, viz: for the extent of four or five hundred miles before you arrive near the mountains, the bed of the river is extensive, and a perfect sand bar, which at certain seasons is dry; at least the water is standing in ponds, not affording sufficient to procure a running course. When you come nearer the mountains, you find the river contracted, a gravelly bottom, and a deep navigable stream. From these circumstances it is evident, that the sandy soil imbibes all the waters, which the sources project from the mountains, and renders the river (in dry seasons) less navigable *five hundred miles*, than two hundred miles from its source. The borders of the Arkansaw river may be termed the *paradise* (terrestrial) of our territories, for the *wandering savages*. Of all countries ever visited by the footsteps of civilized man, there never was one probably that produced game in greater abundance, and we know that the manners and morals of the erratic nations, are such, (the reasons I leave to be given by the ontologists,) as never to give them a numerous population; and I believe that there are buffaloe, elk, and deer sufficient on the banks of the Arkansaw alone, if used without waste, to feed all the savages in the United States' territory one century." Appendix to P. ii. pp. 6, 7.

At the part of the Arkansaw which they first struck, the party remained for several days. On the twenty fourth of October, while on a short excursion from this place, Lt. Pike and Dr. Robertson, (a gentleman who accompanied the expedition,) killed some prairie squirrels, or wishtonwishes, and nine rattle snakes, of the former of which Lt. Pike gives the following account,

"The Wishtonwish of the Indians, prairie dogs of some travellers, or squirrels as I should be inclined to denominate them, reside on the prairies of Louisiana in towns or villages, having an evident police established in their communities. The sites of their towns are generally on the brow of a hill, near some creek or pond, in order to be convenient to water, and that the high ground which they inhabit, may not be subject to inundation. Their residence, being under ground, is burrowed out, and the earth answers the double purpose of keeping out the water and affording an elevated place in wet seasons to repose on, and to give them a further and more distinct view of the country. Their holes descend in a spiral form, therefore I could never ascertain their depth; but I once had one hundred and forty kettles of wa-

ter poured into one of them in order to drive out the occupant, but without effect. In the circuit of the villages, they clear off all the grass, and leave the earth bare of vegetation; but whether it is from an instinct they possess inducing them to keep the ground thus cleared, or whether they make use of the herbage as food, I cannot pretend to determine. The latter opinion, I think entitled to a preference, as their teeth designate them to be of the granivorous species, and I know of no other substance, which is produced in the vicinity of their positions, on which they could subsist; and they never extend their excursions more than half a mile from the burrows. They are of a dark brown colour, except their bellies, which are white. Their tails are not so long as those of our grey squirrels, but are shaped precisely like theirs; their teeth, head, nails, and body, are the perfect squirrel, except that they are generally fatter than that animal. Their villages sometimes extend over two or three miles square, in which there must be innumerable hosts of them, as there is generally a burrow every ten steps, in which there are two or more, and you see new ones partly excavated on all the borders of the town. We killed great numbers of them with our rifles and found them excellent meat, after they were exposed a night or two to the frost, by which means the rankness acquired by their subterraneous dwelling is corrected. As you approach their towns, you are saluted on all sides by the cry of Wishtonwish, from which they derive their name with the Indians, uttered in a shrill and piercing manner. You then observe them all retreating to the entrance of their burrows, where they post themselves, and regard every even the slightest movement that you make. It requires a very nice shot with a rifle to kill them, as they must be killed dead, for as long as life exists, they continue to work into their cells. It is extremely dangerous to pass through their towns, as they abound with rattle snakes, both of the yellow and black species; and strange as it may appear, I have seen the Wishtonwish, the rattle snake, the horn frog, with which the prairie abounds, (termed by the Spaniards the Camelion, from their taking no visible sustenance,) and a land tortoise all take refuge in the same hole. I do not pretend to assert, that it was their common place of resort, but I have witnessed the above facts more than in one instance." p. 156.

On the twenty eighth of October Lt. Wilkinson with two boats and seven men, two of them Osage, left the party to descend the Arkansaw, according to the instructions which had been received. His account of his descent is given in the Appendix. Lt. Pike with the remainder of the party proceeded up this river. For several days they passed in view of numerous

herds of wild horses, elk, and buffalo. On the fourth of November he says,

"In the afternoon, discovered the north side of the river to be covered with animals; which, when we came to them, proved to be buffalo cows and calves. I do not think it an exaggeration to say there were three thousand in one view." p. 160.

On the sixth of November he says,

"I will not attempt to describe the droves of animals we now saw on our route; suffice it to say, that the face of the prairie was covered with them, on each side of the river; their number exceeded imagination." p. 161.

Lt. Wilkinson likewise in his descent met with large herds of wild animals, of which he gives the following account.

"On the eighth of November, in the morning, it having cleared up, I began my march early, and it appeared as if we had just gotten into the region of game; for the herds of buffalo, elk, goats, and deer, surpassed credibility. I do solemnly assert, that, if I saw one, I saw more than nine thousand buffalo during the day's march." Appendix to P. ii. p. 26.

Du Pratz mentions the great number of wild animals about the Arkansaw.

The country over which Lt. Pike and his division were now travelling abounds in salt. There were many bare spots, he says,

"On which, when the sun is in the meridian, is congealed a species of salt, sufficiently thick to be accumulated, but it is so strongly impregnated with nitric qualities, as to render it unfit for use until purified. The grass in this district on the river bottoms, has a great appearance of the grass on our salt marshes." Appendix to P. ii. p. 5.

On the "First Part of Lt. Pike's Chart of the Internal "Parts of Louisiana," (annexed to his work,) four different salt streams are laid down as flowing into the Arkansaw, below the point where the party separated, and above that branch of the Arkansaw called the Canadian river. One of these is said to be seventy five yards, and another fifty yards wide. Salt streams, we presume the same together with two others, are mentioned

in Lt. Wilkinson's account of his descent. Beside these is the Grand saline mentioned by him, which is however not a salt river, but has its name from the quantities of salt found on its banks. The prairie grass, according to Lt. Wilkinson, is here incrustated with salt, which the natives obtain by brushing it off with a turkey's wing into a wooden trencher. Near the salines which he first passed, the earth, according to him, is completely frosted with nitre.* Louisiana in general, says Du Pratz,† contains a great deal of salt petre. He attributes the cloven footed animals' frequenting certain places, though disturbed and hunted there, to their fondness for salt or salt petre, which he seems to confound together, with which the earth is impregnated. Du Pratz likewise says,‡ that in ascending the Black river, (which flows from the southward into the Red river, about thirty miles from the mouth of the latter,) about thirty leagues up the river, a salt stream flows into it from the west, and that a little higher, there are two salt lakes, the largest about two leagues long, and one broad, and the other not much smaller. The water of these is salt, without the bitterness of the water of the sea.

On the fifteenth of November the party came in sight of mountains, which Lt. Pike describes as "a *spur* of the grand " western chain of mountains, which divide the waters of the " Pacific from those of the Atlantic oceans, and it divided the " waters which empty into the bay of the Holy Spirit, from " those of the Mississippi. p, 163.

On the twenty fifth, they arrived at the foot of the mountains. Lt. Pike had determined to accomplish the objects of his expedition, although it should oblige him to spend another winter in the desert. For winter however the party were unprepared even in clothing. They wandered about in the mountains, sometimes separated into a number of small parties, in search of the source of the Red river, from the twenty sixth of November to the twenty seventh of January. During this time they suffered extreme hardships from the cold, and want of provisions. On the twenty seventh of January, Lt. Pike and

* Appendix to P. ii. pp. 26, 29, 30.

† Tom. i. pp. 293, 294.

‡ Tom. i. p. 307.

those who were with him struck a brook flowing west, which they supposed to be the object of their search. Here they formed a stockade. They had remained here about a month, to construct this work, and collect the party, when a troop of Spanish horse, amounting to about one hundred, arrived with orders to conduct them to the governor of New Mexico, governor Allencaster. They were then informed that they had encamped not on the Red river, but on the Rio del Norte in the Spanish territory. All resistance being unavailing, and the Americans in fact the aggressors, though unintentionally, they of course submitted. That part of the American party, who were at their fort were then conducted by a part of the Spanish horse into New Mexico; while another part of the horse waited for the remainder of the former, which were to come in.

WE come now to the third part of Lt. Pike's journal. Conducted by the Spanish horse he arrived at Santa Fe on the third of March. It is situated on a small creek, which runs west to the Rio del Norte. The supposed population he says is four thousand five hundred; according to Humboldt it is three thousand six hundred. Here he had an interview with the governor, who informed him that he must go to Chihuahua in the province of Biscay, to appear before the commandant general. For this place he accordingly set out under the convoy of a Spanish officer, Lt. Malgares. On the second of April they arrived at Chihuahua, and Lt. Pike was introduced to the commandant general Salcedo. A part of his papers, which had been examined at Santa Fe, were here seized. Fortunately he had secreted his journals in the care of one of his men, and his notes of courses and distances, having been copied by Dr. Robertson before mentioned, were likewise preserved. Here they remained to the twenty eighth of April, when they were reconducted back on their way to the Spanish lines. On the twenty ninth of June they parted with their Spanish escort; and on the first of July arrived at Natchitoches, which is situated in the American territory on the Red river. Here the journal concludes. In this part of Lt. Pike's journal, though amusing and

containing some information, we have not noticed much particularly interesting.

There is however in the appendix to this part a piece entitled "Geographical, Statistical, and General Observations on the Interior Provinces of New Spain, from Louisiana to the vice royalty, and between the Pacific Ocean, Gulph of California and the Atlantic Ocean, or Gulph of Mexico," which fills fifty one closely printed pages. In the slight comparison, that we have been able to make of it with the work of Humboldt, on the topics which he and Lt. Pike have in common, we have been more gratified at the agreement of the latter with him than surprised at any discrepancy.

New Spain is divided into two parts, the one Mexico Proper, and the other the Internal Provinces. The former is under the government of the viceroy of Mexico, the latter are under that of a commandant general. It was only in the latter that Lt. Pike had an opportunity for personal observation. To the Internal Provinces therefore his observations principally relate. These are surrounded by Louisiana and the Orleans territory on the north and east, except a small extent of coast on the Gulf of Mexico. On the south they join the viceroyalty of Mexico. On the west they extend to the Pacific. The whole population of New Spain, according to Humboldt, is 5,837,100, of which there are in the Internal Provinces, 357,200. By adding together the numbers, which Lt. Pike gives to each province, we find that the number, which he assigns to the whole of the Internal Provinces, is 567,000. This population is divided, like that of the rest of New Spain; into 1. individuals born in Europe; 2. the Creoles, who are whites of European extraction, born in America; 3. the mixed breed of different kinds; and 4. the Indians, partly civilized, and partly savage; in addition to these there are in the viceroyalty, the negroes; but they do not appear to make any considerable part of the population of the Internal Provinces. All offices and places of trust and profit are bestowed on the first class;* and between them and the whites who are natives of the country, great jealousy exists.

* Humboldt.

"The government has multiplied the difficulties of Europeans intermarrying with the Creoles or Metifs to such a degree, that it is difficult for such a marriage to take place. An officer, wishing to marry a lady (not from Europe) is obliged to acquire certificates of the purity of her descent two hundred years back, and transmit it to the court, when the license will be returned; but should she be the daughter of a man of the rank of captain, or upwards; this nicety vanishes, as rank purifies the blood of the descendants." Appendix to P. iii. p. 37.

The proportions, at which Lt. Pike estimates the European race in the Internal Provinces are, in different provinces, from one to three twentieths; the Creoles at four and five twentieths; the mixed breeds at five and six twentieths; the Indians from seven to ten twentieths.

The government of the internal provinces is military and despotic, more so even than that of the viceroyalty. Laws and regulations are issued by the commandant general in the form of order merely, without any kind of preamble, except sometimes the form "By order of the king," and such likewise is the style of the governors of particular provinces.

The inquisition at Mexico has great power, which extends itself throughout all the provinces. Within a few years they have burnt an heretic and a Jew; the latter however it would seem, not without considerable provocation. They publish lists of prohibited books.

"At so great a distance," says Lt. Pike, "as Chihuahua; an officer dared not take 'Pope's Essay on Man,' to his quarters, but used to come to mine to read it." Appendix to P. iii. p. 47.

The salaries of the archbishops, of whom there are four in New Spain, are higher than those of any other officers in the kingdom. That of the archbishop of Mexico is estimated, according to Lt. Pike, at one hundred and fifty thousand dollars per annum; according to Humboldt, at eighteen thousand four hundred and twenty pounds sterling. The inquisition and the Romish religion have continued in a more flourishing state in the Spanish and Portuguese colonies, than in any other part of the world. Some of the churches even in the Internal Provinces are very rich and expensive.

With regard to the revenues of New Spain,

"I cannot," says Lt. Pike, "presume to state the revenues of the country from official documents, but the following statements I have had from so respectable a source, and they are so confirmed by my own observations, that I think much reliance may be placed on their correctness. The mint coins, per annum, at least 50.000.000 dollars in silver, and 14.000.000 dollars in gold; the one fifth of which (the duty) is equal to 12.800.000. The duties on foreign goods, and the amount paid by the purchasers of monopolies, may be estimated at 4.000.000 dollars, which, with the duty on gold and silver, makes the annual revenue 16.800.000. The civil list of the kingdom is 580.000, the military 7.189.200: these together amount to 7.769.200, which, deducted from the gross revenue of 16.800.000, leaves a clear revenue for the king (from his Mexican dominions,) of 9.030.800. The money paid for the support of the clergy is not included in this estimate, as they receive their revenue through its own proper channel. The best paid officers under the government cost the king nothing in a direct line, yet the oppressive manner in which they pay themselves and impoverish the people, would render it better policy to abolish their impositions, and pay them out of the public treasury by a direct salary." Appendix to P. iii. p. 89.

The support of the clergy is likewise entirely from the people, who pay a tenth of their yearly income for this purpose.

Of the state of the military force of the Internal Provinces, Lt. Pike has given a particular account. The following respects the military force in New Spain in general.

"The European troops are some of the choicest regiments from Spain, consequently we may put them on the supposition that they are well disciplined, and officered by men of honor and science.

"The regular troops of the kingdom who are in the vice royalty, acting from the stimulant of ambition and envy, are supposed to be equal to their brethren from Europe. The militia, with the regular officers, are likewise good troops, but are not held in so high estimation as the other corps. Those three corps, forming a body of 23.288 men, may be called the regular force of the kingdom, as the militia of 139.500* would, in my estimation, be of no more consequence against the regular troops of any civilized power, than the ancient aborigines of the country were against the army of Cortes." Appendix to P. iii. p. 41.

In the Spanish, as in the French armies, corporal punish-

* The part of the militia without regular officers.

ment is not used. The punishments are imprisonment, putting in the stocks, and death.

"As a remarkable instance," says Lt. Pike, "of the discipline and regularity of conduct of those provincial troops, although marching with them doing duty as it were for nearly four months, I never saw a man receive a blow or put under confinement for one hour. How impossible would it be to regulate the turbulent dispositions of the Americans with such treatment! In making the foregoing remark I do not include officers, for I saw more rigorous treatment exercised toward some of them, than ever was practised in our army." Appendix to P. iii. p. 43.

These remarks however, as appears from other passages, do not apply to the civilized Indians in the Spanish service.

The troops of the Internal Provinces are in a very miserable state of discipline, though capable of making fine soldiers. There is a singular regulation in the Spanish army.

"There is another principle," says Lt. Pike, "defined by the ordinances, which has often been the cause of disputes in the service of the United States:—viz. The commandant of a post (in the Spanish service), if barely a captain, receives no orders from a general, should one arrive at his post, unless that general should be superior in authority to the person who posted him, for, says the ordinance, he is responsible to the king alone for his post. That principle, according to my ideas, is very injurious to any country which adopts it." Appendix to P. iii. p. 46.

As an instance of the state of the army, Lt. Pike mentions in his journal the following circumstance, speaking of the lieutenant, by whom he was escorted.

"Malgares' mode of living was superior to any thing we have an idea of in our army; having eight mules loaded with his common camp equipage, wines, confectionary, &c. But this only served to evince the corruption of the Spanish discipline, for if a subaltern indulged himself with such a quantity of baggage, what would be the cavalcade attending on an army?" p. 280.

The people in general, including the lower order of priests, appear, according to Lt. Pike, to be much discontented with the present government, and disposed to independence.

As the whites are disposed to throw off their government, so the civilized Indians, oppressed and degraded, meditate the

destruction of the whites. In speaking of the province of Biscay, Lt. Pike says of these Indians,

"The Christian Indians are so incorporated amongst the lower grades of metifs that it is scarcely possible to draw the line of distinction, except at the ranelios of some nobleman or large landholder, where they are in a state of vassalage. This class of people laid a conspiracy, which was so well concerted as to baffle the inquiries of the Spaniards for a length of time, and to occasion them the loss of several hundred of the inhabitants. The Indians used to go out from their villages in small parties: in a short time a part would return with the report that they had been attacked by the Indians; the Spaniards would immediately send out a detachment in pursuit, when they were led into an ambuscade, and every soul cut off. They pursued this course so long that the whole province became alarmed at the rapid manner in which their enemies multiplied; but some circumstances leading to a suspicion, they made use of the superstition of those people for their ruin. Some officers disguised themselves like friars and went round amongst the Indians, pretending to be possessed of the spirit of prophecy. They preached up to the Indians that the day was approaching when a general deliverance from the Spanish tyranny was about to take place, and invited the Indians to join in concerting with them the work of God. The poor creatures came forward, and in their confessions stated the great hand that had already been put to the work. After these pretended friars had ascertained the nature and extent of the conspiracy, and had a body of troops prepared, they commenced the execution, and put to death about four hundred of the unsuspecting Indians. This struck terror and dismay through the Indian villages, and they dared not rise and declare their freedom and independence." Appendix to P. iii. pp. 22, 23.

In the Internal Provinces agriculture is very far from being in a flourishing state. They cultivate principally different kinds of corn, the vine, and cotton. The use of the cotton gin however, and even of the churn has been but lately introduced. The foreign trade, which is principally carried on from Vera Cruz and Acapulco, is likewise loaded and embarrassed with restrictions and monopolies.

There is according to Humboldt an immense inequality in the distribution of property in New Spain, and vast estates are possessed by private individuals. He mentions one family, which beside an estate of 1,041,750 pounds sterling possesses a mine yielding a net annual income of more than 60,000 pounds sterling; and another family possessing a mine which yielded

in less than six months a net profit of more than 250,000 pounds sterling. Lt. Pike mentions his passing, on his return, the estate of the Marquis De San Miquel, who maintained fifteen hundred troops to protect his vassals and property from the savages.

The morals and manners of the Spaniards of this part of America, unless modified by particular circumstances, seem to resemble those of Europe. They are temperate, hospitable, and generous, and thoroughly corrupt in all other respects.

"The general subjects of conversation," says our present author, "among the men are women, money, and horses, which appear to be the only objects, in their estimation, worthy of consideration, uniting the female sex with their money and their beasts, and, from having treated them too much after the manner of the latter, they have eradicated from their breasts every sentiment of virtue or ambition, either to pursue the acquirements, which would make them amiable companions, instructive mothers, or respectable members of society." Appendix to P. iii. p. 37.

Of the ancient inhabitants of the country, there are still some antiquities to be found. Near the Rio Gila, which discharges itself into the Red River of California,

"are the remains of old walls and houses, which are ascertained to have been the work of the Mexicans on their route emigrating from the north-west to the plains of Mexico, where they finally established themselves. Those walls are of a black cement, the durability of which increases with its age, so that it has hitherto bid defiance to the war of time. Its composition is now entirely lost. There are also found at this place many broken pieces of earthen ware, which still possess the glazing as perfect as when first put on," Appendix to P. iii. p. 9.

Humboldt gives an account of the ruins of a Mexican town on the Rio Gila probably the same with this; though he places it on the southern bank, while Lt. Pike has fixed the situation of that which he describes on the Rio San Francisco, which flows into the Rio Gila from the north east. It was considered by the Mexican historians, according to Humboldt, as the abode of the Aztecs or Mexicans on their arrival at the Rio Gila toward the end of the twelfth century. The whole surrounding plain is covered, he says, with broken earthen

pitchers and pots, prettily painted in white, red, and blue. The walls of the principal building, and so probably of the others, were of clay (*tapia*) rammed down between cases. The same kind of construction, according to Humboldt, is still to be found in villages of Indians west from New Mexico. Villages of this kind Lt. Pike in his journal mentions passing on his way to the capital in the Internal Provinces.

In the Internal Provinces as in the other parts of New Spain, there are various mines of gold, silver, copper, &c. Near Sante Fe in the mountains are strata of talck, so large and clear as be used instead of window glass in most of the houses in that town,

"There is in the province of Biscay, about one hundred miles south of Chihuahua, a mountain or hill of loadstone. Walker, [a person employed about the Commandant General,] who had been on the ground and surveyed it, informed me it appeared to be solid strata, as regular as that of limestone, or any other of the species. He had brought home a square piece of near a foot and a half, was preparing some to be sent to Spain, and likewise forming magnets to accompany it, in order that their comparative strength might be ascertained with magnets formed in Europe." Appendix to P. iii. p. 19.

The magnetic iron ore, to which species the magnet belongs, is found in beds, and sometimes, as in the present instance, constitutes whole mountains. It is found in plates as well as in other forms.

In the Internal Provinces there are immense troops of wild horses; many of which are caught for use. There are likewise buffaloe, elk, deer, goats, and other wild animals.

Of the scorpions of Durango in Biscay, Lt. Pike gives the following account:—

"The scorpions of Durango are one of the most remarkable instances of the physical effects of climate or air that I ever saw recorded. They come out of the walls and crevices in May, and continue about a fortnight in such numbers that the inhabitants never walk in their houses after dark without a light, and always shift and examine the bed-clothes and beat the curtains previous to going to bed, after which the curtains are secured under the bed, similar to the precautions we take with our musquito curtains. The bite of these scorpions has been known to prove mor-

tal in two hours. The most extraordinary circumstance is that by taking them ten leagues from Durango, they become perfectly harmless and lose all their venomous qualities. Query, does it arise from a change of air, sustenance, or what other cause?" Appendix to P. iii. p. 20.

From the different accounts, which we have of the effects of the bite of the scorpion, it is clear, either that the bite of different reptiles of this species, or of the same at different times or in different circumstances, may be venomous in very unequal degrees.

The remainder of the Appendix to the Third Part of Lt. Pike's journal consists principally of documents shewing the approbation of Congress and the President, of Lt. Pike's good conduct in the expeditions committed to him; and of letters, &c. which he addressed to the Spanish governor of New Mexico and the commandant general, while he was in the Spanish territory. To the whole work, are annexed—1. a plan of the Falls of St. Anthony; 2. 3. two charts of the part of Louisiana explored by Lt. Pike; 4. a map of the Internal Provinces of New Spain; 5. a sketch of the viceroyalty of Mexico; 6. a map of the Mississippi from the St. Louis to its source.

We have given so ample an account as to enable our readers to judge for themselves of this work. It will be seen, that it contains information and amusement; and that its author deserves much credit for the spirit and perseverance, with which he conducted the expeditions committed to his care.

ARTICLE 8.

Constance de Castile: a Poem, in ten cantos. By William Sotheby, Esq. Boston, West & Blake, 1812. 18mo. pp. 197.

It could not have been predicted from any one of Mr. Sotheby's former productions, that he would ever accomplish a work of very superior merit, that should entitle him to a much higher place on the scale of poetic merit than he then held. There is so much evenness of execution, such an uniformity of desert in all his works, that we have no suspicion of any unexerted or

undeveloped powers. We discern in them no brilliant flashes, that discover a temporary superiority to himself; no irregular sallies, that mark undisciplined ability; no towering eminences, that display an inviting prospect. His page is not crowded with thought like Crabbe's; nor does it sparkle with beauties like Scott's; nor is it exuberant with delightful ornament like Southey's. But his faults are of deficiency, rather than of excess: they are caused principally by the want of a powerful imagination, of strength of conception, and of spirit in execution. His expressions are smooth and flowing, though far from possessing the full-toned sweetness of Campbell. But they are seldom original or pointed: nor are they so full of meaning, that the thought grows with the line, and no word can be dispensed with: nor so delicate and forcible as to awaken vivid emotions, and impress us deeply with their sense. His vivacity is that of uniform temperament, rather than of excited feelings; which is not so estimable in poetry, as in character. There is no magic in his verse; nothing that makes us pause to admire, and captivates us unknowingly. Nevertheless, Mr. Sotheby has not been read without interest, nor praised without desert, by such as are pleased with descriptions that discover an amiable character, and a taste for nature's softer beauties. He is sometimes elegant; he has so much purity of taste, that he is not likely to offend, and the morality of his poems in general, though nothing to distinguish the poet, must produce complacency in the man.

His first work was the translation of Wieland's *Oberon*, a poem, which, though beautiful, has been most extravagantly overrated. It was published in 1798. This translation has deservedly been praised for the harmony of its versification, in a difficult measure; but we are not disposed to give very high applause to the writer, who has made accessible and grateful to the English reader a poem, discovering a taste egregiously faulty, and whose boasted excellence of moral is more than counteracted by the seducing wantonness of many of its descriptions. In 1800, Mr. Sotheby published his version of the *Georgics*. He has here also displayed his command of language, but he has in some instances deviated rather too far from the original,

to be credited as an entirely faithful translator. This production however, in which he places himself in competition with Addison, Dryden, Warton, and Pitt, has procured for its author no inconsiderable reputation. His next work of magnitude was *Saul*, a poem in blank verse, published in 1805. This is by no means equal to either of the others we have mentioned. We here find much harshness of versification, and many lines of false and inaccurate measure. Mr. Sotheby does not soar so high, when he rises with the assistance only of an historical ground work, as when he is constantly supported by the vigor of a firmer wing. He used dangerous materials, as they were derived from sacred history, from which much deviation is not allowable; and it requires more spirit in the execution, and more richness of decoration, than are displayed in this poem, to render interesting a trite narrative. But it is a poem of mild character, from which many pleasant, and some fine passages may be selected. Mr. Sotheby has besides published a tour through Wales, odes, sonnets, and other poems; a poetical epistle to sir George Beaumont, on the encouragement of the British school of painting, which, we believe, has considerable merit; *Oberon*, a *Mask*, which is a dramatic abridgement of the poem; *Orestes*, a *Tragedy*; *Julian and Agnes*; and the *Siege of Cusco*; so that he is an author of works, rather numerous, and somewhat various. He alludes to several of these works in the following passage from *Saul*.

"Lov'd haunts! that heard my song of other years:
Whether I swept the chords high-pitched to strain
Heroical, when Britain's chief appall'd
Th' Invader, and on Egypt's sea of blood,
Like an avenging angel, rode in fire:
Or, lapt in dreams of faery, I wove
Light lays of elfine loom: or fondly strove
To modulate the Mantuan reed: or hail'd
The Muse of Athens, when Orestes rose
Before my trance: bear witness, haunts of peace!
How more delightful far than all that fed
My youthful melodies, this theme divine
Which thrills my awe-struck spirit; while I muse
On God, and mighty miracles, and thee,
Thee, Word creative!"—Part ii. B. i.

Constance de Castile was first published in 1810; this we believe is Mr. Sotheby's last work. It is professedly founded upon history, the period of which is during the latter half of the fourteenth century. The subject appears to have been selected with reference to the connexion at present subsisting between England and Spain, as the incidents principally relate to the union of John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, with Constance, the daughter of Pedro the cruel, king of Castile. In thus choosing his subject from history, Mr. Sotheby must either have intended to illustrate and commemorate its events, or to save himself the expense of invention, or to increase the interest in fictitious circumstances, by a mixture of reality. In the first case, no deviation from the correct narrative should be allowed; in the others we do not expect strict obedience to it. Mr. Sotheby was probably influenced by both of the latter motives. Not venturing to stand alone, and trust only to his own invention, he selected a story, which was likely to interest his countrymen at the present period, and perhaps he was at liberty to adhere to it or not, as he pleased. We shall not therefore condemn the deviations from it, presuming that his readers will not consider the poem as historical authority. Pedro, by the enormity of his vices, and the tyranny of his government, had alienated his people, and induced his bastard brother, Henry count of Trastamara, to rebel. Henry, with the assistance of Bertram du Guesclin, at the head of the vagabond banditti who infested France at that time, and with the consent of Charles the wise, the king of France, invaded Castile, was received by the people, and finally obtained possession of the kingdom.

At the commencement of the poem, Corunna, almost reduced by famine, was the only city which still resisted the victorious Henry.* A year had elapsed since Pedro had left it, to

* There are several notes appended to this volume, which contain sometimes authorities for the truth of the incidents of the poem, sometimes illustrations, and at others mere assertions of facts. In these we have a right to expect and demand strict adherence to history, for they profess to give correct information. But we suspect there are some mistatements, which we will notice.

The first note we believe is incorrect. Pedro retreated from city to city, the country revolting only as the usurper advanced, and he passed

seek assistance from Portugal, where he was treacherously detained. A stormy night is described; a boat is faintly discerned from the watch-tower of Corunna, riding on the billows; it reaches the shore.

"Hark! as the swift keel ploughs the strand,

Hark! eager acclamations ring,

'Castile! come forth! hail, hail thy King!

Thy long lost King returns, and greets his native land!" p. 10.

Pedro lands amid the congratulations of his adherents, and is received with joy by his daughter Constance. But overcome with grief for his own misfortunes, and for the distresses and dangers of his friends; with rage against his enemies, and with the stern anguish of conscious guilt, he retires alone to the vault which contained the sepulchre of Maria de Padilla, well known in history as his mistress, or his privately married wife, who was so beloved by the king, that she was thought to be an enchantress, and who induced him to the murder of Blanche of Bourbon, his queen. He enters,

"Now—ghastly pale, now—fiery red,

As one by horror visited." p. 25.

through Galicia and embarked at Corunna for Bayonne. He was refused assistance from Portugal, but was not besieged at Corunna, for when he was there, Henry was in the southern part of the kingdom at Toledo or Seville. It was but about fifteen months from the time of Henry's invasion to Pedro's return. See Mariana, B. xvi. 5. Univer. Hist. B. xix c. 1.

The authority of Dillon, produced in the third note, does not prove that don Pedro was imprisoned in Portugal, while the testimony of Froissart renders it very improbable. "When the king of Portugal heard in what manner his cousin don Pedro had been slain, he was mightily vexed at it, and swore he would have satisfaction for it. He immediately sent a challenge to Henry, and made war upon him, remaining master of all the environs of Seville for a whole season."

In a note to the third canto, Johnes' Froissart is quoted as asserting that Ferdinand de Castro was the only knight who followed Pedro from his kingdom. A few pages after this account the translator has detected its incorrectness, and has the following note with respect to some compact between Edward and Pedro. "The number of witnesses to this deed, shows that Froissart was misinformed, when he says, 'that don Pedro was solely attended by Fernando de Castro.' According to Mariana he embarked at Corunna with his family and twenty two ships."

Here the half frantic king is disturbed by a terrific vision of his poisoned queen, and of a murdered knight. To free himself from the sight before him, he is about to kill himself, when he is interrupted by Constance and Anselm the priest, who calm his emotion. The third canto has among its first stanzas the following description, which we extract as poetic.

“ Bright in the heav’ns, one beauteous star
Shone, heralding Aurora’s car,
When Constance, on th’ embattled keep,
Hung o’er Corunna hush’d in sleep.
Beneath her, where the champaign spread,
From each deep glen, each mountain head,
Gray mists on mists began to rise
Wafting pure incense to the skies.
While lull’d on Ocean’s heaving breast
Lay the wild winds in halcyon rest,
To fancy’s ear the sea-maid’s song
Came on the flowing of the tide,
Wave leading wave, soft stole along,
Touch’d the low level sands, and died:
Yet not a wave was seen to flow,
So thick the dun haze hung below.
Now slowly melting into day
Vapour and mist dissolv’d away,
And the blue world of waters round
Met the far heav’n’s o’er-arching bound:
And, gleaming through the gorgeous fold
Of clouds, around his glory roll’d,
The orb of gold, far off, half seen,
Levell’d his rays of tremulous sheen,
That widely as the billows roll
Glanc’d quivering on their distant goal.” pp. 35, 36.

The arrival of Almanzor, king of Lybia, is then described, who comes to demand the hand of Constance. He offers the alternative of peace and plentiful supplies, or war; and the famished garrison favor his suit. The king refers the decision to Constance.

“ Amid Corunna’s suppliant throng
As the fair victim rush’d along,
Again the Moor before the King
Held up the spear and nuptial ring,
Again round Pedro rung the cry,
‘ Save!—for thou can’st—for thee we die!’

'Live, warriors, live!'—the Virgin cried—

'My doom is fix'd—Almanzor's bride.' " pp. 46, 47.

Thus Constance is pledged to become the bride of *Almanzor*, unless, within a year, his kingdom should be restored to *Pedro*, and the hand of Constance be demanded by some Christian knight of princely rank. The next canto describes the court of Edward, the black prince, at Bourdeaux, at that time thronged with knights, for the celebration of a festival, The songs of the minstrels are finished when

"A Stranger, clad in palmer's weed,
Leapt from a spent and panting steed." p. 63.

"The Stranger, at the banquet door,
As one well-wont to state and place,
Check'd the rude swiftness of his pace:
And casting off the palmer's gown
On the fresh reeds that strow'd the floor,
In graceful guise, bow'd lowly down,
And stood before each wondering guest,
A page in royal livery drest,
Nor boy, nor man, in bloom of life
When youth and manhood seem at strife,
A royal page:—'twas clear to view—
Velvet his mantle, crimson hue;
With ring and brooch his kirtle grac'd,
And gold the sash that girt his waist.
Yet—like the lily's beauteous flow'r,
That lonely droops beneath the show'r,
And hanging o'er its humid bed
Seems from its cup a tear to shed;
So wan his hue, so fair his face,
Where woe had left its lingering trace." p. 64,

This page was Julian, the illegitimate child of *Ellen*, the sister of *Pedro*, and the companion and friend of Constance, who had left *Corunna* before *Pedro* had returned. His suit for assistance for Constance is seconded by the princess *Joanna*, Edward's spouse, and he departs with pledges of love and assistance from the duke of Lancaster,* and with an invitation from Edward to Constance to repair to his court. The tale of Julian is introduced, which concludes with the following verses.

* The famed John of Gaunt.

" 'Twas, when Maria sunk to rest,
 The new-born Constance on her breast,
 When Pedro o'er her fondly hung,
 The blessing trembling on his tongue,
 From the last kiss of Ellenor,
 The Nuns her hapless Orphan bore.
 Laid on Maria's couch, the child
 Look'd on her face, and sweetly smil'd.
 ' Hence!'—the stern Monarch fiercely cried—
 ' Hence! with some nameless peasant place
 That stain of the Castillian race.'

Maria's sigh alone replied.
 She thought on Ellen, dead and gone,
 And the orphan in a world alone;
 Then—clasp'd to her maternal breast
 The babes, caressing and carest,
 Their arms in innocence entwin'd.—
 That sight o'erpowered stern Pedro's mind,—
 ' So, peaceful, on that bosom rest!
 So pass,'—he cried—' your infant year!
 And blest them with a father's tear." pp. 95, 96.

Shortly after the return of Julian to Corunna, an English vessel arrives, and Pedro embarks with Constance for Bordeaux, to claim assistance from allied England. Meanwhile, at Edward's court a splendid tournament was preparing, and a long description is given of the dresses of the combatants, which were assumed to represent the heroes of the times of Arthur and Charlemagne, in which there is a greater display of chivalric lore, than of poetry, and which is probably introduced to occupy the time necessary for king Pedro's voyage. His arrival is announced by the page Julian, who rushes amid the prepared combatants, breathless and wounded, and alarms them by cries for assistance for Constance and Pedro, who, even in the harbor of Bourdeaux, were attacked by a Moorish vessel.

" Speed, Conqueror,—speed!—the Paynims fling
 Their fetters round Castilia's King,
 And rudely seized the captive Maid.
 What earthly pow'r shall Constance aid!
 Lo!—Lancaster high waves the blade,
 And bold the peerless fair to save,
 Or, greatly perish in the wave,

Spurs down the stream his foaming steed.
 Fill'd with his fire, with lightning speed,
 The rival chiefs, knight urging knight,
 Stem the deep flood, and join the fight." p. 116.

The captive king and his daughter are soon released. In the following night Pedro has a dream, in which he foresees his own final subjugation and murder by his brother Henry.*

* In a note upon the dream of Pedro, Mr. Sotheby has again quoted Froissart, and attributes the seizure of the king to the Bégue de Villaines, and expresses a doubt which is copied from the translator Johnes, whether the relation of Froissart is not to be preferred to those of Mariana and Ferreras. These respectable historians attribute it to the treachery of Bertram du Guesclin, who promised to assist the king Pedro in escaping from the castle of Montiel where he was besieged, but betrayed him to Henry; and their testimony is rejected by Mr. Sotheby for the same reason probably that it is by Johnes, "because avarice was not a vice of such gallant men;" a curious reason indeed, when we consider that this was an age when crimes were so frequent, and religion so degraded, that vice was hardly disgraceful. We leave our readers to choose between the authorities, reminding them that Froissart and Bertram were both Frenchmen. But the particulars of the seizure, as related by Froissart are interesting, although he may be incorrect as to the person concerned in them; so much so, that we extract the following account.

"After the defeat of king Pedro and his army, king Henry and sir Bertram encamped themselves before the castle of Montiel, where don Pedro was: they surrounded it on all sides."—"This castle was of sufficient strength to have held out a considerable time, if it had been properly victualled; but when don Pedro entered it, there was not enough for four days, which much alarmed him and his companions. They were so strictly watched, that a bird could not escape from the castle without being noticed.

"Don Pedro was in great anguish of heart at seeing himself thus surrounded by his enemies, well knowing they would not enter into any treaty of peace or agreement with him; so that considering his dangerous situation, and the great want of provisions in the castle, he was advised to attempt his escape with his eleven companions about midnight, and to put himself under the protection of God; he was offered guides that would conduct him to a place of safety.

"They remained in the castle with this determination until midnight, when don Pedro, accompanied by Fernando de Castro and others of the eleven companions set out. It was very dark. At this hour le Bégue de Villaines had the command of the watch, with upwards of three hundred men.

"Don Pedro quitted the castle with his companions, and was descend-

This is a proof of Mr. Sotheby's want of very great inventive genius, for it is merely a versification of the history of the death of the king, and has nothing in it of the wildness and confused-

ing by an upper path, but so quietly that it did not appear as if any one was moving; however, the Bégue de Villaines, who had many suspicions, and was afraid of losing the object of his watch, imagined he heard the sound of horses' feet upon the causeway: he therefore said to those near him: 'Gentlemen, keep quiet, make no movement, for I hear the steps of some people, we must know who they are, and what they seek at such an hour. I suspect they are victuallers, who are bringing provisions to the castle, for I know it is in this respect very scantily provided.' The Bégue then advanced, his dagger on his wrist, towards a man who was close to don Pedro, and demanded, 'Who art thou? speak, or thou art a dead man.' The man to whom Bégue had spoken, was an Englishman, and refused to answer: he bent himself over his saddle and dashed forward. The Bégue suffered him to pass, when addressing himself to don Pedro, and examining him earnestly, he fancied it was the king, notwithstanding the darkness of the night, from his likeness to king Henry, his brother, for they very much resembled each other. He demanded from him, in placing his dagger at his breast, 'And you, who are you? name yourself, and surrender this moment, or you are a dead man.' In thus saying, he caught hold of the bridle of his horse, and would not suffer him to escape as the former had done.

"King don Pedro, who saw a large body of men at arms before him, and found that he could not by any means escape, said to the Bégue de Villaines, whom he recognised, 'Bégue, Bégue, I am don Pedro, king of Castile, to whom much wrong has been imputed through evil counsellors. I surrender myself and all my people, but twelve in number, as thy prisoners. We place ourselves under thy guard and disposition. I beseech thee, in the name of thy gentility, that thou put me in a place of safety. I will pay for my ransom whatever sum thou shalt please to ask; for, thank God, I have yet a sufficiency to do that; but thou must prevent me from falling into the hands of the bastard.' The Bégue (according to the information I have since received,) replied, that he and his company might come with him in all security, for that his brother should not from him have any intelligence of what had happened.* Upon this consideration they advanced, when don Pedro was conducted to the tent of the Bégue, and into the chamber of sir Lyon de Lakonet. He had not been there an hour when king Henry and the viscount de Rocaberti, with their attendants, but not in great numbers came thither. As soon as king Henry had entered the

* "There are different accounts of this affair. Ferreras attributes the capture of don Pedro to Bertram du Guesclin, and not much to his honor, but I cannot believe this, as avarice was not a vice of such gallant men, and am inclined to believe Froissart has been rightly informed." Trans.

ness of terrifying dreams. Edward, with the assembled knights of his court, among whom appeared one unknown to the rest, being concealed under the disguise of his closed armour, on the day after the arrival of Pedro, declares his readiness to hear his suit. "Yet blood is charged on Pedro's brow," and he

chamber where don Pedro was, he said, 'Where is this son of a Jewish whore, who calls himself king of Castile.' Don Pedro, who was a bold as well as a cruel man, stepped forward and said, 'Why thou art the son of a whore, and I am the son of Alphonso.' On saying this, he caught hold of king Henry with his arms, began to wrestle with him, and being the strongest, threw him down under him: placing his hand upon his poignard, he would infallibly have killed him if the viscount de Rocaberti had not been present, who, seizing don Pedro by the legs, turned him over, by which means king Henry being uppermost, immediately drew a long poignard, which he wore in his sash, and plunged it into his body. His attendants entered the tent and helped dispatch him.

"Thus died don Pedro, king of Castile, who had formerly reigned in great prosperity. Those who had slain him left him three days unburied, which was a pity for the sake of humanity; and the Spaniards made their jokes upon him."^{*}

The character of Pedro is among the worst that disgraces history. The fourth note to the eighth canto of *Constance de Castile* intends to vindicate him from the charges of cruelty; it is true that his bad actions would have escaped censure, had they been few, for the character of the times permitted much that now committed would deeply disgrace the perpetrator. But the title of Peter, viz. "The cruel," the aversion of his subjects, and above all, the facts recorded of him by all historians, must convince any one who reads his history of his enormous baseness. There was such meanness in his vices, and such a destitution of that high spirit and sense of honor, which has given splendor to so many crimes, that it is impossible to feel any complacency in Pedro. He was avaricious, treacherous, and "debauched, cruel, cunning, and faithless in a supreme degree;"† he was the murderer of his brothers, and of his queen. The guilt of Blanche of Bourbon is far from being proved by the quotation from Voltaire, p. 190. especially when his testimony is opposed by common belief, and by the uniform testimony of history. See Mariana B. 16. ch. 3. *Life of Bert. du Guesclin.*

We wish that Mr. Sotheby had laid claim to no historical accuracy, or that he had possessed more.

^{*} *Johnes' Froissart*, ch. 243. An account resembling this in many particulars, and like this very interesting, may be found in the "*Memoires de Bertrand du Guesclin*," (in the "*Coll. Univ. des Mem. partic. relatifs. a l'Hist. de France*,") ch. 19.

† *Universal Hist.*

must exculpate himself from the heavy charges against him. This produces a confession from the king, after which, upon his promise to endow a chantry, and go as a warrior to the holy land, he is absolved by a reverend priest, who was present, and then more successfully again urges his claims.

" At once, ere Pedro's closing word,
Up from their seats the warriors sprung,
Lept from each sheath th' avenging sword,
The roof with martial clangour rung:
Brave Lancaster, before the rest,
Exultant to the Virgin prest,
His hand now hover'd o'er the veil:
When in the thunder of his mail,
With lightning speed, with eye of fire
Baring his brow in scornful ire,
The stranger knight before him flew,
His outstretch'd arm a dagger drew,
Shook o'er the maid in vengeful mood:
' Hence or this poniard drinks her blood.
Behold Almanzor, Afric's King.' " pp. 144, 145.

But Lancaster throws down his gauntlet, and challenges his rival to prove his merit by the sword. A combat, after the common fashion of such combats, ensues, in which Almanzor is slain. The veil is removed from Constance, and Lancaster claims her as his bride. The last canto commences with an allusion to the modern glories of Britain, particularly her late victories in Spain. The march of Edward's army is then described, in which Constance proceeds, attended by Julian and Lancaster.

" Gay balancing with flexile grace
The cadence of his courser's pace,
On his barb'd roan in martial pride
Castillia's champion woos the bride,
And wins her with heroic tale
Of wars where youthful knights prevail,
Deeds of renown for beauty done,
And realms, for love of ladies, won.
'Twas Constance, 'twas her subtle thread
That o'er his belt its broidery spread;
'Twas her fair hand its fancies wove,
Emblem of bliss and nuptial love.

Where the bright texture richly glow'd,
 In silver wave the ocean flow'd.
 There floating in a pearly shell
 Whence light as from a rain-bow fell,
 Went Hymen veil'd, and gaily wreath'd
 A garland where fresh roses breath'd.
 Cupid here played the pilot's part,
 His rudder was a diamond dart:
 Wide wav'd his plumes, each wing a sail,
 Fluttering its feathers in the gale.
 An emerald its centre shone,
 And changeful opals clasp'd the zone." pp. 158, 159.

The progress of the army is arrested at the pass of Ronceval, where earl Roland and his warriors fell, by an hermit, who bids them respect the spot, and pay their tribute of regard to the memory of the hero. Constance advanced,

" By high heroic impulse fir'd,
 And seiz'd the harp as one inspired." p. 168.

She exhorts to the imitation of the deeds of Roland, and fills them with martial ardor, when their attention is arrested by the inspired hermit, who announces the success of their expedition, and then foretells the distresses of Spain from its present invader, the tyrant of France, and the succour it would receive from the " empress of the main." With " the prophetic ode of the " hermit " the poem closes.

Such a conclusion is abrupt and unsatisfactory, and it appears premature. The characters in the poem being suddenly taken from our view, almost as soon as we have become interested in them, we must be satisfied with the knowledge of their fate, which we may derive from the hints of the prophetic ode. The story, though it has some faults, and deserves no praise for originality of plan, or ingenuity of arrangement, is entertaining. Mr. Sotheby has neglected, we think rather unskilfully, one of the most certain and lawful arts of exciting and maintaining interest, which is, to keep the reader in ignorance of the approaching event, so that while the train of incidents is continually provoking curiosity, the developement shall produce surprise. This inattention is observable in the first canto.

We are told that the boat which approaches Corunna contains its monarch, which destroys our power of sympathising with the eager expectations of those who discern it from the tower, and we feel no surprise, which otherwise we might have done in a high degree, when the arrival of the long lost king is declared. The palmer who arrives at Edward's court, we instantly know, for we have before been told of Julian's adventure. So too as soon as Pedro leaves the harbor of Corunna, we expect the attack which is made upon his vessel, being told that Almanzor is in ambush. Such anticipations diminish our interest.

We are confirmed by this poem in the opinion which we have expressed of Mr. Sotheby's character. We said he was deficient in imagination; and there are in this poem no incidents or imagery which disprove the assertion. This deficiency appears in the structure of the narrative, in the style of versification, and in the triteness of the epithets and metaphors. We have here the same lions and storms,* which have been common stock since the days of Homer. We said also that Mr. Sotheby did not discover much strength of conception, or spirit in execution; and the character of Pedro, which was capable of being very highly wrought, is very inadequately brought out. Nor should we attribute to Mr. Sotheby from this poem, any more than from his others, much originality. But most of his poetic ideas, and many of his expressions, indicate that he has been a studious reader of poetry. We are very often reminded of other writers by some phrase which we thought peculiar, or even by trains of ideas, and modes of descriptions, which we indistinctly remember to have before met with. The hermit's ode in "Constance," compels us to recollect "The Bard" of Gray; not from any similarity of beauties, but from an analogy of structure and expression. We do not mean to accuse Mr. Sotheby of plagiarism, or of direct and designed imitation; but it seems as if when he composed he had other poetry than his own in his mind; as if he did not describe so much from conception of his subject, as from the recollection of other descriptions.

We can say of this poem, what has been said of almost

* pp. 117, 147.

each of Mr. Sotheby's former productions, that it will not increase his reputation; but we cannot so confidently add what has been usually added, that it will not at all diminish it. Constance de Castile cannot be so highly praised as either of his translations, and we doubt whether it should rank so high as Saul. We certainly cannot extract so fine passages from it, as may be found in the description of Saul's advance to battle, and of his conduct during and immediately after the repulse. But if Mr. Sotheby is still far below the highest class of poets, even of poets of the present day, he is certainly not below all praise. We are not at all disposed to retract or qualify the tribute which we have already paid to his delicacy, purity, elegance, or taste. We will condemn no one for admiring his poems, because (with the exception of Oberon) there is nothing in them to injure; but we ourselves must be permitted to be only moderately pleased with them.

ARTICLE 9.

An Introduction to the Geography of the New Testament, comprising a summary chronological and geographical view of the events recorded respecting the ministry of our Saviour; accompanied with maps, questions for examination, and an accented Index. By Lant Carpenter, LL.D. Cambridge, Hilliard & Metcalf. 1812. pp. 224.

THIS valuable little book is introduced by a modest preface, in which its object and principles are briefly stated. Seventy pages are then occupied with a geographical account of the countries, cities, islands, seas, &c. which are mentioned in the New Testament. It begins with Spain, and proceeding eastward, describes the places in order as far as Persia, and then shortly notices the countries of Africa, ending with Æthiopia. The descriptions are short, but clear; and though minuteness does not seem to have been intended, yet the study of this book would afford sufficient knowledge of the geography of the New Testament for common readers. There are also various remarks interspersed, containing much valuable information. The

following accounts of the cities of Samaria and Jerusalem will exemplify Dr. Carpenter's condensed and simple manner.

" 50. The capital city also was called Samaria. [It was once the metropolis of the ten tribes, who separated from those of Judah and Benjamin, and formed a distinct kingdom, about nine hundred and seventy five years before the Christian æra. When the ten tribes were carried away captive into Assyria, a number of Assyrians were introduced into their country, who mingled with those Israelites who were left, and with those who afterwards returned. These people brought with them their idolatry, and taught it to the conquered natives: but it seems that before our Saviour's ministry, the Samaritans had returned to the worship of God. They however materially differed from the Jews. They received the books of Moses only, as of divine authority; and they considered Mount Gerizim as the only place in which worship was acceptable to God.

" 51. The greatest aversion existed between the Jews and the Samaritans. Both nations probably had some cause for their hostile feelings; and both certainly exaggerated the sources of their ill-will. The separation of the ten tribes,—the opposition of the Samaritans to the rebuilding of the Jewish temple after the Babylonish captivity,—the erection of a temple on mount Gerizim,—and their ill-treatment of those who passed through their country to worship God at Jerusalem, are sufficient to account for the aversion of the Jews. No doubt there were equal causes for the aversion of the Samaritans; but we have only Jewish historians. It is certain that the Maccabees seized and destroyed the capital, and subjugated the country.—It is obvious that the Samaritans were in expectation of the Messiah; and that they were disposed to admit the claims of Jesus.

" 52. It is not certain that the city of Samaria is spoken of in the New Testament; the words in Acts viii. 5. should be rendered 'a city of Samaria,' as in John iv. 5. That city might be Samaria, but of this we can only conjecture." pp. 42, 43.

" 54. The capital of Judæa was *Jerusalem*. It was in a central situation, on the confines of Benjamin and Judah; so that part belonged to the territory of the one, part to that of the other. It was built on hills, but, being surrounded with higher hills, it could not be seen, in some directions, till the traveller came very near it. It was situated on a very stony soil; and the country round it, for several miles, was dry and barren.—The extent of the city differed considerably at different times: it had acquired its greatest extent at the time of its final ruin. It then comprehended four hills, Sion, Acra, Moriah, and Bezetha. Sion was in the southern part of the city, and immediately to the north of it was Acra. Sion was considerably the higher, and that part

of the city which was situated on it, was called the upper city; and on Acra was the lower city. On the south and west of Sion was a very deep valley, which rendered it inaccessible on those sides; on the north was a high wall, which was built by David. Moriah, on which stood the temple, lay to the east of Acra. It was separated from it by a valley, which was nearly filled up, that the access to the Temple from Acra might be more easy. Moriah was about three-quarters of a mile in circumference. It was connected with Sion by a bridge and a terrace. To the north of it was another hill, called Bezetha, which Agrippa joined to the city; and the whole was then about thirty three furlongs in circumference." pp. 45, 46.

For the convenience of teachers who may use this book, the principal topics which have been treated are brought together at the end of it, so that they may be used as questions for the examination of the pupil. The following are the questions for the passages which have been extracted.

"50. Of what was the city of Samaria the capital? What caused the mixture of inhabitants in the country? Consequence. Religion in our Saviour's time. In what respect did they differ from the Jews?—51. Causes of the aversion of the Jews;—of the Samaritans. In what respect were the latter well disposed? 52. Is the capital mentioned in the New Testament?" p. 195.

"54. Situation of the capital of Judæa. Extent. Relative situation of each of the hills. Extent of that on which the temple stood. How was it connected with the other parts of the city? Circuit of the whole.—" p. 196.

There are also four maps accompanying this Introduction. The first is a general outline of all the countries mentioned in the new Testament. The second contains the places which are described in Italy, Greece, and Asia Minor, and the islands of the Mediterranean. The two others are the most important. The first of them is of Palæstine, from the reduced map of D'Anville, but it differs in several of its divisions from this great authority. The last is a very miserable sketch of the plan of Jerusalem, being imperfect in matter and execution. We should have much preferred a complete copy of D'Anville, even if Bethphage and Bethany must have been omitted, which would not however have been necessary.

The second part, which makes more than half of this volume, and which is intended "to give an outline of the leading facts in the New Testament in the order of time," contains a new method of harmonizing the four gospels.

Although above an hundred harmonies of the four gospels may be found, in various languages,* many of which have been planned with great ingenuity, and arranged with great care, yet the principles upon which harmonists have proceeded have been so various, and the modes of application of the same principles so numerous, and the skill with which different systems have been defended has been so great, that it is a work of immense labor to attain a full view of the ground of this diversity; and if this view should be obtained, the decision to be made is most perplexing to the judgment; and perhaps it is impossible to obtain conviction of the correctness of any one hypothesis.† For hypothesis is all that we can obtain on this subject, there being nothing decisive in the gospels on many questions which it involves, and there being no positive evidence to be derived from any other source. But we do not consider the subject unimportant. The associations of time, as well as of place, must give greater interest to narrative, and greater force to precept: the period which we suppose to have been occupied by our Saviour's ministry, must affect our opinions concerning the manner in which he was received by his countrymen, and perhaps our ideas of his activity and engagement. We are not therefore displeased at a new attempt to harmonize the gospels, and shall willingly examine into its merits.

"The leading principles of the arrangement are, 1. that the ministry of Jesus included two Passovers only;—2. that John vi. 4. refers to the latter, at which Jesus was crucified;—and 3. that Matthew's order claims a general preference. If any one of the three be true, Archbishop Newcome's arrangement cannot be correct; and if the second be true, Dr. Priestley's arrangement can-

* Marsh's *Michaelis*, vol. iii. ch. 2. s. 6. note 24.

† This is the opinion of Griesbach:—"valde enim dubito," says he in the preface to his *Synopsis Evangeliorum*, "an ex evangelistarum libellis harmonica componi possit narratio, veritati quoad chronologicam pericoparum dispositionem satis consonantia, et firmis fundamentis superstructa."

not be correct. The general features of the arrangement here given, depend upon the two former; many of the minutiae upon the last. The second only is peculiar to it; and this removes every difficulty attending the first. I believed that this principle is at least *consistent* with the opinions of the early Christian writers: but I did not expect to find it countenanced by any modern. G. J. Vossius, however, was led to the very same opinion, for the same object, though by a different train of reasoning. (See Newcome's first letter to Priestley, p. 118.)" Preface p. vi.

We shall make some remarks on each of the principles here stated.

One of the principal questions on which harmonists have been divided has been concerning the principles upon which the events recorded in the gospels are arranged. Some, at the head of whom was Osiander, have maintained that each fact, recorded by either of the Evangelists, has its proper chronological place assigned to it in the narrative. To this opinion the most obvious and quite satisfactory objection is, that events mentioned by more than one Evangelist are frequently placed in different relative situations by the several writers. For instance, in John ii. 14—17. is an account of the clearing of the temple by our Saviour: an account of the clearing of the temple is also given by each of the other Evangelists,* which differs from that of John in nothing essential, except as to the period to which it is assigned. From the narrative of the latter this event seems to have taken place at the first passover in our Saviour's ministry, which is mentioned after the baptism; Matthew, Mark, and Luke, refer it to the last. The solution of this difficulty is twofold; either the order of time was neglected by one or more of the sacred writers, or two events took place so similar as to have nothing to distinguish them, but such circumstantial diversity as could not be avoided by writers who had no connexion with each other, excepting their situation in the respective histories. If this were the only instance of diversity of arrangement, which might be produced, the last supposition could be admitted, but, as facts of this kind are numerous in the New Testament, it is very difficult to assent to the hypothesis; (upon which we are to believe that miracles and

* Matth. xxi. 12. Mark xi. 15. Luke xix. 45.

remarkable events so similar, that no disagreeing circumstances are noted in the different accounts of them, occurred more than once;) especially when we have so easy a substitute as that which we have mentioned;—that one or more of the Evangelists neglected the order of time. If these similar accounts of different occurrences were found in the same gospel, there would be nothing to object to their diversity; but is it not unaccountable on this hypothesis, to mention only one of many instances, that although such an important event as the clearing of the temple did occur twice, that it should be mentioned once and only once by each of the Evangelists? The case is different with respect to the repetition of the same parables, or the same sayings, although we are far from allowing the license which has been used as to these, by some harmonists. But this hypothesis is the only answer which is made to the objection which we have stated, and those harmonists therefore, who consider each of the gospels to be chronologically arranged, have supposed all events mentioned by more than one Evangelist, the accounts of which do not occur in corresponding places, to have occurred more than once.

To avoid the very obvious and insuperable difficulty, which attends this opinion, harmonists who have had less superstitious reverence for the sacred text, have denied that attention was paid to the order of time by all the Evangelists, and agreed that some transpositions must be made to produce an orderly and harmonious arrangement. But these have also differed as to the transpositions to be made, and as to the gospel to whose arrangement the others must be made to conform. One of the Evangelists must be allowed to have paid some attention to the dates of his events, or there can be no dependence on any order which may be proposed. The gospels of Matthew and John, who were apostles, on this account are justly thought to have greater authority as to the dates of events, especially after the period when they were called to be ministers, than those of Mark or Luke, because their writers had better means of information. It has indeed been thought, that Luke intended to adhere to chronological arrangement, because he says in his preface that he meant to "write in order." But this phrase is no authority

for the opinion: it may be and has by judicious interpreters been supposed to refer to the previous accounts which are before mentioned by him, and to mean only that he would digest those accounts into one continued narrative, which was so far in order as the facts before contained in separate tracts were in this history connected. But, if this phrase does prove that it was Luke's intention to place his events according to their dates, his arrangement would still be of less authority than that of Matthew or of John, if the same intention was manifest in them. We should not hesitate, if there should be any difference between them, whether to take as our guides eye-witnesses and apostles, or one who probably was not present at one of the events which he relates, and perhaps never saw our Saviour. But the arrangements of Mark and Luke even when differing from those of Matthew and John are of some value, as we shall see. John and the other Evangelists have very little in common, but it is from those of his facts, which are also noticed by the other historians, especially by Matthew, that the places of the others are to be determined, as far as they can be determined.

We have seen that Matthew and John are the best authorities in chronology, but these two authorities disagree with respect to the position of some of the few facts recorded by both, so that we are now compelled to choose between them—whose arrangement we will follow. Both cannot be right, unless for the sake of reconciling them, we admit the notion that similar events, accompanied by similar circumstances, and having a similar connexion with other events, occurred more than once. In opposition to Le Clerc and other learned men, we are inclined to give the preference to Matthew. It is true that there is nothing internal, of consequence, to disprove the correctness of the order of John; but when it is compared with that of Matthew, there are several reasons why we should allow it less authority. Matthew commences with an account of the birth of our Saviour, and continues his narrative to the fourteenth chapter, not with very great minuteness, but with an apparent attention to the order of events, and from the fourteenth chapter to the end, the connexion of the history is uninterrupted. The facts recorded after the fourteenth chapter then we

believe to be placed in their proper relative places, because it was evidently intended; those before that chapter we *suppose* to be in proper order, because there is no proof of the contrary, and it would be analogous to the latter part. We are confirmed in our opinion,

“—by the nature of John’s Gospel, which is universally allowed to have been intended by the Apostle as supplementary to one or more of the preceding narratives, and which consists of sections, or parts which have no mutual connexion or dependence, except their common subject:—and by the fact, that John has assigned specific dates to his sections, and that therefore, upon the opinion of the early Christian writers respecting the duration of our Lord’s ministry, no difficulty occurs from the order of those sections, unless it can be proved that John intended to write in the order of time; but this opinion has no countenance from the nature of his Gospel, and is inconsistent with the order of events in Matthew’s Gospel, which in the latter part of the Gospel, coincides with that of Mark, and (though less obviously) with that of Luke.” pp. 82. 83.

These sections are so marked, that their dates would readily be known to those who were familiar with the duration of the ministry, as no doubt the early Christians were. As, “And the Jews’ passover was at hand.” ii. 13. “When he was in Jerusalem, at the passover.” ii. 23. “And the Jews’ feast of Tabernacles was at hand.” vii. 2. “And it was at Jerusalem, the feast of dedication, and it was winter.” x. 22. This is somewhat as though speaking of the actions of Moses, we might first mention some things that occurred in the wilderness, then his deeds while in Egypt, or when he abode in Ethiopia. The times in which he was in these places, we well know, and if we are to add any thing to former accounts, it is of but little consequence whether the disconnected events be placed in exact order. Thus we may suppose that John, as he wrote to supply deficiencies, might have thought that the general periods were known, and that the particular dates of his events would be sufficiently designated by the notes which he made. That the

“* The *first* section comprehends chap. i.—iv. inclusive; the *second*, chap. v; the *third*, chap. vi; the *fourth*, chap. vii.—x. 21, the *fifth*, chap. x. 22.—xi. 54; the *sixth*, chap. xi. 55.—xii. For the dates of these sections see chap. ii. 13, chap. v. 1. chap. vi. 4. chap. vii. 2. chap. x. 22. chap. xi. 55.”

events he relates are not, as they now stand, in chronological order, we proceed concisely to show, from the places of two of them. The first is the clearing of the temple, which, as we have already mentioned, is related in connexion with his first mention of a passover after the baptism; whereas it is placed by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, at the passover when he was crucified. The authority of Matthew, supported by Mark and Luke, (whose support at least proves the common opinion of those times,) may be sufficient to decide the question, but we observe in confirmation, that the assumption of so great authority, and the performance of so odious an action at so early a period, would not have been consistent with the concealment, or cautious disclosure of his character, at other times observed by our Lord. Such an event must have excited much attention. Notwithstanding, some time afterwards, Herod first heard of the fame of Jesus,* and his brethren, as though he was unknown there, bid him go into Judea to perform his works.† We think the conclusion irresistible, that the account of the clearing of the temple given by John does not bear correct chronological relation to his accounts of other events. Dr. Carpenter however supposes that the temple was cleared twice. We regret that he has given his sanction to this opinion.

The other instance of incorrect arrangement which we will give, is the feeding of the five thousand. Immediately before the account of this miracle John says, "The passover, a feast of the Jews, was nigh;"‡ and in subsequent chapters mentions a feast of Tabernacles, and a feast of Dedication, from which, according to John's arrangement, it follows, that the passover here spoken of could not have been that at which he was crucified. But Matthew has placed this event in the fourteenth chapter, in the beginning of that uninterrupted narrative, which we have before mentioned, extending to the end of the Gospel. Now a little more than a month is sufficient for all the events recorded in this portion, and as no long period of leisure is alluded to by Matthew, we conclude that the passover was nigh,

* Matthew, xiv. 1.

† John, vii. 3.

‡ For other arguments, see Priestley's *Dissertations*, connected with his harmony, sect. 15.

§ John vi. 4.

when the five thousand were fed; that this passover was the last of the ministry; and that the arrangement of John is again faulty, as this account should properly have been given after what related to the feasts of Tabernacles and Dedication.

From what we have now observed, as well as for other reasons, we have concluded that Matthew is the only tolerably accurate guide, as to the order of the events of our Saviour's ministry. We shall make use of this conclusion hereafter.

Another important subject which has received much attention, is the duration of our Saviour's ministry. It has been very variously limited. Before the time of Eusebius, who lived in the fourth century, it was the opinion of the fathers, we believe with the exception of Irenæus only, that the ministry lasted only one whole year and part of another, or contained but two passovers. Irenæus extended it to twenty years.* With Eusebius began an opinion that it lasted more than three years, or contained four passovers, which has long been that which has been most generally adopted. Another supposition, which has been maintained by some respectable authorities, on whose account we would treat it with more respect than of itself it deserves, has been, that the period of the ministry contained five passovers.

Sir Isaac Newton, supposing both Matthew and John to have written in chronological order, deduced this opinion from their accounts, and endeavoured to establish it by astronomical calculations.† But Mann defends his opinion, that the ministry contained less than two years, also by astronomical calculations,‡ and the whole question is so difficult, embarrassed, and

* "Irenæus indeed, who lived in the second century, is an exception to the rule; but his opinion on this subject was so absurd that it is hardly worth mentioning. For in zeal against the Gnostics who, as well as the fathers of the three first centuries, believed that Christ's ministry lasted about a year, he goes so far as to extend it to nearly twenty years: in proof of which he appeals to John viii. 57. where certain Jews say to Christ—'Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?' Hence Irenæus argues that Christ was really not far from fifty at that time, and consequently that nearly twenty years had elapsed from the time of his baptism." Marsh's *Michaelis*. Vol. iii. c. 2. § 7. note 9.

† Newton on Daniel, ch. 11.

‡ Mann de Veris Ann. Natal. et Emort. Christi.

uncertain, that the argument founded on it, on either side, is of very little value.* Macknight, supposing all the Evangelists to have written in chronological order, has likewise extended the duration of the ministry so as to include five passovers. But we have already expressed our opinion that his fundamental principle is altogether untenable.†

Bengel, in 1736, adopting an opinion, which had been maintained by Apollonarius Laodiceus and Epiphanius,‡ placed the period at little more than two years; while Mann in 1733 revived the ancient opinion of its short continuance. Dr. Priestley, as it was natural for a man of his activity of mind to object to the protracted period which had by some been assigned to our Lord's ministry, adopted Mann's principle, and defended it with some difference of application against Archbishop Newcome, who constructed an harmony on the plan of Le Clerc, whose opinion was the common one, of the three years duration of the ministry.

Our Lord's ministry continued then, either about three years, or between two and three, or a little more than one. The first opinion, that it continued about three years, or contained four passovers, has for its foundation four passages in John's gospel: "The passover of the Jews was nigh, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem," ii. 3. "After this there was a feast of the Jews and Je-

* "Difficillima et abstrusissima illa de passionis dominicæ tempore disputatio tota ex anni Judaici forma, quæ per illa tempora apud Hebræos unitate fuit, pendere videatur." Petavius, as quoted by Mann, Diss. ii. chap. 30.

For a refutation of Newton's hypothesis, see Bochart, Hierozōici, lib. ii. cap. 50. Opp. vol. ii. coll. 558 to 571. as referred to by Le Clerc in his Harmony, Diss. i.

† "Macknight," says Marsh, "instead of diminishing, has increased the number to five, the reason of which I have not been able to discover, unless the temp ~~εἴρη~~ used in John vii. 2, though St. John has expressly explained it by ~~εὐφροσύνη~~, gave rise to the conjecture."

Macknight has however stated the ground of his opinion, as may be seen in a note to the seventy fourth section of the Paraph. and Comm. upon his harmony.

‡ Apoll. Laod. ap. Hieron. in Daniel, c. 9. Epiphani. Har. l. i. n. 22. as quoted by Macknight in the preliminary observations to his harmony, Obs. 5.

sus went up to Jerusalem," v. 1. "And the passover, a feast of the Jews, was nigh," vi. 4. "And the passover of the Jews was nigh," xi. 55. As in the second of these passages no express mention is made of a passover, there is no ground for the supposition that a passover was alluded to, and those who maintain the second opinion have supposed that it does not refer to a passover, but to some other feast. The third opinion appears to us most probable, and the arguments which we shall state in its favor will include the objections to the two other opinions.

An objection thought by many to be entirely decisive against our opinion must first however be noticed. It is drawn from the express mention of a passover in John, vi. 4, a passover which is clearly distinct from the first, because a feast mentioned John v. 1. intervenes, and cannot, say the objectors, mean the last, because a feast of Tabernacles and a feast of Dedication are mentioned between the sixth chapter and the eleventh, in which last the history of the last passover is given. With those who adopt our own opinion, as to the mode in which St. John's gospel is written, this objection is of no weight, as we have concluded that the passover here alluded to must be the last. Mann, and after him Dr. Priestley, endeavoured to remove the difficulty by placing the sixth chapter before the fifth, (which transposition they supported by very plausible arguments,) and expunging the word *passover* in the fourth verse of the sixth chapter, and supposing the feast referred to, to be the same mentioned in chap. v. 1. which they thought to be the feast of Pentecost. The omission of this word was also thought necessary by G. J. Vossius. They considered it as an exposition of the verse, at first written in the margin by some scribe, and afterwards introduced into the text. Could this alteration of the text be supported, and the transposition also be admitted as a correction of the error of a copyist, the objection would indeed be removed, even from the minds of those who adhere to the arrangement of John. Bishop Pierce would avoid the necessity of the transposition, by supposing the whole verse vi. 4. to be an interpolation.* But to both these propositions for al-

* "There does not seem to be any reason for the Evangelist's inserting this verse, nothing in the chapter having any relation to the feast of the

tering the sacred text we make but one reply, with which every friend to its purity must be satisfied; which is, that they are supported by no authority of manuscripts, versions, or quotations by the fathers. A transposition of any portion of the narrative is not so objectionable, therefore we were much better pleased with the new and ingenious solution proposed by Dr. Carpenter. He considers the passover referred to, to be the last, and proposes to place the whole of the sixth chapter, except the two first verses, between the fifty-fourth and fifty-fifth verses of the eleventh chapter. If a transposition must be made, we admit this to be the best, and if the narrative of John is to be made orderly, it is necessary. But we confess we look upon the attempt as hopeless, for if John himself intended to write in strict chronological order, that order is now lost; if he did not, we may ascertain the relative places of the events, (which indeed is quite sufficient for harmonists,) but we cannot produce perfect continuity of relation. Thus, although we believe Dr. Carpenter to be correct, as to the place he assigns for the feeding of the five thousand, yet we perceive an unnatural repetition when we connect the first and second verses of the sixth chapter with the beginning of the seventh.* This however is of

passover, or to any other of the Jewish feasts. G. J. Vossius, and W. Mann, (in *de Anno Emortuali Christi*, p. 173,) are of opinion that the word *παῖστος*, (*passover*,) is an interpolation; and I think that the whole verse is so; because in chap. v. 1. mention is made of a feast, (probably the feast of Pentecost,) and in chap. vii 2. of the feast of Tabernacles, between which two no feast appointed by the law of Moses intervened. It does not appear from the Evangelists' account, that Jesus was present at the feast of the Passover here mentioned; and yet it seems probable that he who fulfilled all righteousness would not have been absent from a feast of the Passover, which, (as is here said,) was then nigh at hand." See Bishop Pierce's Comment. in loco.

* After making the transposition proposed by Dr. Carpenter, the passages read thus:

John vi. 1. "And after these things, Jesus went over the sea of Galilee, which is the sea of Tiberias. 2. And a great multitude followed him, because they saw the miracles which he did on them that were diseased. vii. 1. After these things Jesus walked in Galilee; for he would not walk in Jewry, because the Jews sought to kill him."

And we may observe the same as to the repetition of the remark that the passover was nigh in vi. 4. and in xi. 55. which are to be closely connected.

little consequence, as we have before observed, as to the making of an harmony.

Having then removed this principal, and almost solitary objection to Dr. Carpenter's hypothesis of the duration of the ministry, the same hypothesis which those Christians who lived nearest the time of our Saviour adopted, and which in modern times Mann revived, and Priestley more fully defended, we proceed to mention some of the arguments in its favor. 1. Mr. Mann founded his opinion upon the interpretation of the prophecy of the seventy weeks, but this argument cannot here be fully explained, and is perhaps of doubtful force. 2. He says "The passage in Isaiah lxi. 1, 2, which our Lord read in the synagogue at Nazareth, and which he notified to be then fulfilled, viz. "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, for he has anointed me "to preach the acceptable year of the Lord," was anciently thought to signify, "that Christ was to preach but one year, "distinguished by that appellation." But, as Dr. Priestley acutely remarks, "the interpretation is so very singular and "unnatural, that it could never have suggested the opinion; "but the opinion once previously fixed, viz. that Christ preached only one year, might very easily have led such interpreters of the scriptures as the fathers were to that explanation of "the text, and that nothing but a corresponding opinion generally received could have made such an interpretation supportable. It could never have stood its ground against a contrary opinion."* This argument from the opinion of the fathers proved not only by these remarks, but by many other facts, we think is very strong; for it would be remarkable, that those who lived nearest the time of Christ should be detected in an error of such a nature, by others who lived several centuries after. 3. Luke has dated the commencement of the preaching of John the Baptist, which may be considered as the beginning of his history, with remarkable accuracy. And if there are no means of ascertaining the times of the other events which he mentions by their connexion with this, then this minuteness must appear useless, as the times of the most important facts

* Priestley's *Dissertations* connected with his Greek harmony, sect. 6, 7.

are left undecided. This is thought to be an internal argument of some weight in favor of the hypothesis of the short duration of the ministry, "as it is acknowledged," says Dr. Priestley, "that had no other gospel than that of Luke been extant, it must have been taken for granted that the whole history, from the commencement of the preaching of John to the death of Christ, was comprehended within the space of less than two years, no mention of passovers or other marks of time indicating the contrary." 4. Such phrases are never used by any of the Evangelists, as *after one year*, or *after two years*, as would be natural, if so long intervals existed between events, although the lapse of days is frequently noticed. 5. After the death of the Baptist, Herod first heard of the fame of Jesus.† Would this be credible, if Christ had been publicly preaching for a year before the death of John, as those who think the ministry lasted three years suppose?—6.

"There were three national festivals instituted by Moses, at which every Jew was under a general obligation to attend;—the Passover, towards the end of March; the Pentecost, about the middle of May; and the feast of Tabernacles, towards the end of September. There was another considerable festival, called the Feast of Dedication, which was celebrated about the beginning of December; but this was not instituted by Moses, and was not obligatory upon any Jew. Upon the opinion of the early Christian writers, we must suppose the following festivals to have occurred during the Ministry of Jesus,—the Passover, the Pentecost, the Feast of Tabernacles, the Feast of Dedication, and a second Passover. Now if we admit that the festival mentioned in John v. was the Pentecost, and there appears no internal evidence to the contrary, each of these festivals is distinctly noticed by John, and our Lord attended at each of them. This furnishes a strong presumption in favor of the ancient opinion; and it is increased by considering the state of the case upon the prevalent though less ancient opinion, that the Ministry of Jesus began about six months before a Passover, and that he was crucified at the fourth Passover from his baptism. During that interval, the Passover, the Pentecost, and the Feast of Tabernacles, each occurred thrice; and besides these nine national festivals, the Feast of Dedication was thrice celebrated. Now we are not informed that our Lord was present at more than three of the national festivals, besides the Passover at which he was crucified; and, admitting that the Passover spoken of in John vi. 4. was not the last Passover, there

† Matth. xiv. 1.

are still, on the common hypothesis, five national festivals, which are not noticed in the Gospels.—Attention, then, to the order and number of the Jewish festivals, materially increases the presumption in favour of the ancient opinion, respecting the duration of our Lord's Ministry; it also furnishes us with the means of ascertaining, with some degree of precision, the dates of several of the leading facts." pp. 75, 76.

Thus whether John wrote chronologically or not, his having mentioned these festivals and not any more, and no account being found of any other journeys to Jerusalem, than the journeys to those feasts, which surely would be noticeable events, we conclude that all the festivals at which Jesus was present are mentioned. 7. The prejudices of the apostles would hardly have continued so strong, if they had received the instructions of Christ for three years. 8. The high priesthood was an annual office: the passover was the time of making a new high priest. Luke tells us that Annas and Caiaphas were high priests during the fifteenth year of Tiberius, which beginning in August would include parts of two paschal years, which commenced in March or April. But Caiaphas was high priest when Jesus was crucified. This will well accord with the supposition that there were but two passovers in the ministry. Previous to the first of them Annas was high priest, and Caiaphas succeeded him and continued to the second. 9. There are several series of events noticed by the Evangelists as occupying small spaces of time, during which our Saviour must have been exceedingly active, as a week or two before the crucifixion. A few months thus spent would be sufficient time for all the events recorded in the gospels. And as our Lord went about doing good, and as his good actions excited much odium, as he necessarily opposed the prejudices of the Jews, and excited the ill will and anger of their rulers, it is inconceivable that he could have been suffered to pass three years in his ministry. A series of miracles like those of Christ, must in a shorter period than this have excited great commotion throughout the Jewish nation, and either have made all acknowledge him as the Messiah, or so embittered his enemies, as to have produced his destruction. So long a display of his power could not, we think, have been made, consistently with the ends of our Saviour's advent, and it is more honorable to

him to suppose, that his important purposes were obtained by active exertions during a short period.

Dr. Carpenter is very concise in the statement of the principles of his arrangement:

"An elementary work," he says, "would be thought an improper place for the full discussion of the grounds of the arrangement; but a brief statement of them may not be useless to the thoughtful, inquiring pupil; and, till a reference can be made to a detailed view of the principles of the hypothesis here advanced, and the arguments in its favor, it seems requisite in justice to the author." pp. 72, 73.

We wish very much that he may explain and defend his new system at large; we must be grateful to him for what he has done in this book; but we fear that the subject is too perplexed and difficult to permit many, except studious theologians, to appreciate his merits or detect his errors, from a statement so short as necessarily not to be very lucid. We have not therefore at all confined ourselves to Dr. Carpenter's arguments, but have principally taken our arguments from Dr. Priestley.

It has been perceived, that there are two questions with respect to an harmony, which are themselves distinct, although their results are connected: viz. the duration of the ministry; and the order of events. The question, which of the Evangelists wrote in chronological order, is of importance to each. On the first of these questions we have given our opinion, and after the decision of this, the difficulties with respect to the other are not very great; and differences of opinion are not very material among those who agree as to the duration of the ministry. But a statement of these differences, and a defence of any particular opinions would require too minute a detail to be here admitted. We shall confine ourselves to a general account of Dr. Carpenter's arrangement.

Dr. Carpenter supposes the baptism of Christ to have taken place on the sixth of January, A. D. 28.* The time between the twenty third of May and the twenty fourth of September is supposed to have been passed in retirement.

* The year from which our era commences, and the year in which Christ was born, are not the same, on account of some error in the fixing the date of the birth of our Saviour. St. Luke says, that Christ was about thirty years old, when he was baptized.

"Accustomed to suppose the whole of our Lord's ministry, however long its duration, constantly and publicly occupied in prosecuting the objects of it, we are at first unable to admit the possibility of such an employment of so large a proportion of it. The considerations advanced in § 7. however seem to present greater difficulties on any opposing hypothesis, and those here felt are lessened by the following statements. 1. The leading Jews had already sought the life of Jesus; hence he could not continue openly in Judea. (John vii. 1.) 2. In all probability, Herod was in Galilee during the time of which we are speaking; if so, the way was not clear, and Jesus was not to expose himself to danger needlessly. 3. It seems that Jesus was not publicly known during the time of John, (Matt. xiv. 2. xvi. 14.) and that he waited till the Ministry of his forerunner was finally closed before he fully exercised his own, (see Matt. iv. 17.) 4. We need not suppose that our Lord, though in retirement, was unemployed. The words in John vii. 3, 7. seem to refer to actions and discourses, which were not much known. 5. There are other intervals of whose employment we know little or nothing; the forty days in the Desert; the abode at Bethabara, and near Ephraim, &c. (John x. xi.) 6. The difficulty presses equally, if not more heavily on hypotheses already proposed. Long intervals necessarily occur in every arrangement formed upon the hypothesis of the long duration of our Lord's ministry;—and even in Dr. Priestley's arrangement, we find several of the *later* months, unoccupied, as will be obvious to any one who inspects his Calendar, or Mr. Field's, which is formed upon it: a very large proportion of the time from the beginning of August A. D. 28. to the beginning of March A. D. 29. has no assigned employment. Either Dr. Priestley's arrangement or that here advanced, seems preferable to any that have been formed on the less ancient opinion as to the length of our Lord's Ministry; but the former is burdened with no inconsiderable difficulties, independent of that mentioned in § 3. Whether the latter lies under equal pressure must be left to the judgment of others; but two of those difficulties may be briefly stated:—the fact related in Mark ix. 30, 31. is placed by Dr. Priestley in July, and that related in Luke ix. 51. in September, where in one case only six months had passed out of the eleven between the beginning of our Lord's public preaching in Galilee, and his crucifixion, and in the other only about three months:—and that portion of his Ministry, which we should *a priori* expect to be most occupied and most dwelt upon by his historians, has comparatively little employment assigned to it." pp. 80, 81, 82.

This period, of which we have no account, he places between the eleventh and twelfth verses of the fourth of Matthew. Indeed he considers seven months to have elapsed after the

temptation, before the commencement of the public preaching in Galilee. Some of the events of that period are related by the other Evangelists. It should be observed in justice to Dr. Carpenter, that between the same verses—the eleventh and twelfth of Matthew, Archbishop Newcome supposes an interval of a year, Macknight of six months, and Dr. Priestley of one month. It is necessary even upon the supposition of the short duration of the ministry, to suppose some considerable intervals, of which there is no account. If this is a difficulty when the ministry is thought to have continued but little more than one year, how much more does it press upon the other hypotheses? Dr. Priestley indeed supposes the interval in this place to have been but one month; but in the months from the beginning of August to the end of February of the next year, he places but very few events. He supposes as long intervals as Dr. Carpenter, but at times much less probable—at the close of the ministry.

Dr. Carpenter arranges the events in seven divisions. The first is from the Baptism, January sixth, to the miracle at Cana, which was about the twenty ninth of February. The second comprehends all the events to the commencement of the public preaching in Galilee, October sixth. In this division he includes the first passover, March thirtieth; the walk through the corn-fields, April seventeenth; the pentecost, May twentieth; the imprisonment of the Baptist, some time in September; the feast of Tabernacles, September twenty fourth. The third division goes to the mission of the twelve, November twenty fifth, including his two journeys through Galilee; the first of which he began October seventeenth, the second November eighth. The fourth extends to the return of the twelve about February fifth, A. D. 29, containing the mission of the seventy, November twenty eighth, and the feast of Dedication, December second. The fifth division ends with the departure of Jesus from Galilee, March fourth, including the feeding of the five thousand, February twelfth. The sixth carries us to the resurrection of Jesus, Sunday, March twentieth, and the seventh ends with the ascension; April twenty eighth. There

is also another division, in which he places several events and discourses, the proper places of which cannot be ascertained.

A chronological digest of the events of the Gospel history into sixty eight paragraphs, at the end of which references to chapters and verses are given, occupies nearly sixty pages. A table of our Lord's journeyings then follows, and a short calendar, taken from Priestley, is added.

The second chapter of the second part contains an outline of the history of the apostle Paul, and a table of his journeyings.

In the Appendices there are arrangements of the sections of White's Diatessaron, and of Field's Questions, so as to adapt them to the view here given of the ministry, and a table of distances.

There are questions to the second part, as to the first, for the purpose of examining students. The book is ended by an accented index of Scripture proper names.

We cannot conclude without a recommendation of this book, as a useful manual for theological students, and a valuable guide to instructors. Its style is neat, and modest; and it contains much condensed information; some of the principles are new, but we think well of the judgment of the writer.

ARTICLE 10.

The Curse of Kehama: a poem by Robert Southey. New-York, Longworth, 1811, 2 vols. 12mo.

Metrical Tales and other Poems, by Robert Southey. *Nos hæc novimus esse nihil.* Boston, C. Williams, 1811. 18mo.

WE doubt whether Mr. Southey has yet attained his full share of reputation. Perhaps however the slow growth of his fame is proportioned to its future greatness and duration. There have been various circumstances, which have contributed to expose him to what seems to us rather an undue share of the assaults of criticism. One of these is, that Mr. Southey is really

an eminent poet. His faults are seen by the light of his own excellence. *Marked out by dangerous parts he meets the shock.* Poets tolerably eminent, (if we may use such an expression,) have their defects and errors, as well as those who are much their superiors; but to their defects and errors there is nothing to draw particular attention. It is the blemishes of excellence, that are regarded. How many thousand orators have there been, and some of them it may be presumed very decent ones too, who have written bad verses; and yet we hear of none of their bad verses except those of Cicero. It is a happy thing that eminence is thus watched, and so little suffered to have faults with impunity; for the faults of one great man soon become, if they are to be acquired, the faults of very many little men. Fortunately however, there is in the course of things a pretty high premium given for their exposure and punishment; and this circumstance has had its full operation against Mr. Southey. The fame (we mean the notoriety), if not the reputation of a critic, accommodates itself in some degree to that of the author whom he attacks. Some of the splendor of a great genius is thrown upon him who approaches near enough to pretend to notice its defects. The shoemaker who found fault with the painting of a sandal, and whose story has been transmitted down to us for two thousand years, and is still fresh as at first, would have been remembered no more than any other shoemaker of Athens, if the painting had not been the work of Apelles. It required all the wit and genius of Arbuthnot, Swift, and Pope to embalm and preserve the perishable verses of Blackmore for the amusement of posterity; but the fame of Dryden has imparted a portion of its vitality to his critics and his enemies, and some of their scurrilities are now enchased in the writings of Johnson. Mr. Southey in like manner has excellence enough to give interest to almost any criticism on his writings. Of criticisms there have of course been abundance. When he wrote his life of Kirke White he had been reviewed, he tells us, more than seventy times; and the review, which we are now writing, is probably more than the hundredth. But it is not to be supposed that all this critical acumen has been exercised for nothing: faults enough in all reason have probably been charged

upon him, and this the more because it might seem obviously a greater exercise of ingenuity to point out what could not, than what could be praised.

But another cause of Mr. Southey's temporary want of great popularity is, that he is an original poet; and original poets, and reformers, and all that sort of people; must not expect their contemporaries to be very ready in answering their claims for praise, and must trust somewhat to the honor of posterity for making up deficiencies. Mr. Southey's modes of writing being in a considerable degree peculiar to himself, and not formed upon any authorised model, he has disconcerted and confounded the regular critics. They came to the examination of his writings with their established rules, the best possible in respect to the poetry to which they had been applied; with their traditionary remarks, and hereditary criticisms; with their tastes formed upon the prevailing modes of excellence, and not much disposed to relish any other; and ready to judge of these new writings from analogy, and by comparison with those whose reputation was established; and they found themselves very much unqualified for their undertaking. They understood perfectly well the rules of Grecian and Roman architecture in the construction of poems; but these they complained were entirely neglected by Mr. Southey. Even his epic poems were neither Homeric, nor Virgilian, nor after the manner of Milton: if they had been, their precise rank might easily have been settled. In order to judge his writings correctly, it was necessary to recur back to the first principles of taste and criticism, and with these perhaps the critics of whom we speak were not perfectly acquainted. It was on the whole much less hazardous to censure, than to commend; for the beauties of Mr. Southey were often of a kind, which had not prescription in their favor. New modes of excellence we know do not commonly please those who have been long accustomed to the old, even where they imply no censure upon these latter, and are not intended to set them aside. Mr. Southey's poems therefore have been condemned as not classical, not in a good taste, and he himself called to account, as a disturber of the established order of

things in the republic of poetry, an innovator, an heretic, and the founder of a new sect.

Another cause, why Mr. Southey's reputation is less than it ought to be, is the contempt which he has been disposed to manifest for the opinion of the world. He has shown too much impatience of that hard dealing which eminent merit is apt to meet with, and of that tardy justice with which his reputation is measured out to him: he has not *borne his faculties meekly*; he has discovered too much of the pride of genius. The first orator of Rome used to be somewhat disconcerted, whenever he began to speak in public. He did not think it proper, perhaps, to suppress this mark of respect for his audience. But Mr. Southey announces himself to us, in the commencement of his last publication, with declaring, that he shall write according to his own caprices, and cares for pleasing nobody but himself. He tells us in a quotation,

" For I will for no man's pleasure,
" Change a syllable or measure."

Now though one may write to please himself only, yet as he has no business to publish except to please others, this is a declaration, which, however a man may have been provoked to it, the world is inclined to resent, and to make him feel the value of that opinion which he thus takes upon him to despise.

We may give as a reason also for the fact we are endeavouring to account for, that Mr. Southey has been supported by no party. He has had no national or religious prejudices in his favor; and political prejudices, as far as they have operated at all, have had an effect against his reputation. He has been obliged to rely solely on his merits, and has thus descended to the contest with none of those advantages, which most of his rivals have enjoyed. ▀

Among Mr. Southey's poems, his *Thalaba* appears to us to deserve the first rank. It is composed of materials from the East, and every thing introduced appears in oriental costume. It is founded upon fictions which are connected with the delightful remembrances of our early years, and which retain through life their influence upon a poetical imagination. It is

full of descriptions and images which seem to embody themselves to our view, and appear before the eye of the reader, as they did before that of the poet. Though the wildness of its story does not admit of a sober and permanent interest, yet while its spell continues, it charms us with a tone of feeling sometimes tender and domestic, sometimes dignified and sublime, and sometimes hallowed by the influence of an holier religion than that which is directly introduced. It is a poem which produces somewhat the same state of mind, that might be felt by him, who should be suddenly removed from a scene of irksomeness and care, to one of the enchanted palaces of eastern fiction, where all within should be splendid and wonderful, and all without blooming and luxuriant.

The next rank among Mr. Southey's poems is perhaps due to his *Madoc*. It has an admirable subject for an epic or narrative poem; the discovery of a new part of the world, and the foundation of a new empire by men remote from their native country. It brings into contrast two different races of men, the mountaineers of Wales, with their high poetic spirit, and the natives of America, with their new manners and strange superstitions. Its events are for the most part well imagined, and at all times powerfully described. In the storm and in the battle it displays the genius of the poet. It has many beautiful descriptions of external nature, and many fine touches of sentiment and natural feeling. From the resemblance of its subject to the discovery of America by Columbus, and the conquest of Mexico by the Spaniards, it borrows all the historical interest belonging to these events. It must be confessed, however, that while there are many passages of very beautiful poetry, and while the story itself engages our attention, there is some want of interest in the principal persons introduced. Its characters have not sufficient individuality. The fault with regard to them seems to be, that Mr. Southey describes less the outward signs and workings of passion, than the passion itself, and the internal movements of the mind. He tells us too little how his characters acted, and too much how they thought and felt. But though the latter mode of description may afford opportunity for fine poetry, it does not give us so vivid an impression

of the persons introduced by the poet, and of course we do not feel so lively an interest in their fate. These remarks however apply much more to Mr. Southey's European than to his American characters, who are with much skill discriminated from each other, while at the same time their national resemblance is preserved throughout.

"Joan of Arc" was the earliest production of Mr. Southey of considerable length. It contains much beautiful and much unfinished poetry. It wants uniformity, and harmony of general character. It displays likewise somewhat of morbid sensibility and false sentiment, which are not to be found in Mr. Southey's later works.

Not many men, it seems to us, have ever displayed more than Mr. Southey the talents which constitute a poet of the very first rank. He has in no common degree the power of vividly conceiving, with all the feelings and impressions which they ought to produce, the scenes and images which he is desirous to picture. They appear to rise at his will, to form themselves before his mind, and to remain there without danger of their vanishing or fading. He does not write, as many other poets of some eminence appear to write, merely from a state of excited feeling, and from a recollection of the common-places of poetry, or with the invention of language and expressions analogous to these; but he writes from the stores of his own mind, and from the vivid pictures of his own imagination. He appears to survey at once all the scenes and images which he is about to represent, and to have them before his mind as they would be before the eye of a beholder. He views them in their connexion with each other, and thus brings forward those circumstances of relation, one with another, which give to his whole description consistency, and an air of reality. He describes sometimes with all the beauty of poetical language, and all the apparent truth of ocular testimony. In the poem, which is the subject of the present review, *Ladurlad* after receiving his terrible curse is thus described:—

" There where the curse had stricken him,
There stood the miserable man.
There stood *Ladurlad*, with loose-hanging arms,
And eyes of idiot wandering.

Was it a dream? alas,
 He heard the river flow,
 He heard the crumbling of the pile,
 He heard the wind which shower'd
 The thin white ashes round.
 There motionless he stood,
 As if he hoped it were a dream.
 And fear'd to move, lest he should prove
 The actual misery;
 And still at times he met Kehama's eye,
 Kehama's eye that fasten'd on him still."

By this incidental recurrence to the funeral pile before described, near which he was placed, and the river on the bank of which he was standing, they are brought before us, as if they were real objects.

Nor is Mr. Southey's imagination confined to one class of objects. Wherever he transports us, *Thebis aut Athenis*, [in Arabia, America, or Asia, in the heavens of Hindoo mythology, or in the cave of the enchanters beneath the ocean, all things seem to be equally known to the poet, and equally subject to his art. It is wonderful how familiar his imagination is with scenes and objects of different classes, none of which can be supposed to be often dwelt upon by an European mind. The praise indeed is to be shared between his learning and his genius; for his industry must previously have collected the materials, on which his imagination employs itself.

From the same cause however which gives Mr. Southey so high a rank among poets from his powers of vivid conception and strong feeling, proceeds one of his principal faults; a fault, which we suppose passes with most readers under the name of extravagance. There is no force however in this charge of extravagance, in the manner we have seen it made, as if there were something faulty in the mere introduction of supernatural agency, or the scenes of enchantment. We are not ready to condemn the machinery of Homer, or the wild creations of the fancy of Shakspeare. But Mr. Southey, carried away by his own imagination and feelings, sometimes forgets that his reader does not come to the subject equally prepared, and equally familiar with it, as himself. To sympathise with a poet, it is necessary that we should have some feelings associated with

that class of objects which he describes, similar to those which he is endeavouring to excite. The objects must not be entirely new to us. They must at least have a resemblance to others, with which the mind is previously acquainted. We must not have to pause for an explanation when called upon for our interest. The germ of the idea, which he wishes us to possess, should be in our own minds, and only have to expand itself beneath the warmth of his imagination. It is very difficult to excite our better feelings in favor of objects much unlike those, toward which they have been usually exercised. Even where there is considerable resemblance, they may be paralyzed by a single circumstance of glaring dissimilitude. No human powers in a poet would be sufficient to make us feel respect and love for the creatures of Swift's imagination, the people of Brobdignag, or Lilliput; and this merely because those feelings have with us been associated with beings about five or six feet in height.

A poet of as much imagination and feeling as Mr. Southey may, by suffering his mind to dwell upon subjects whose contemplation is peculiar to himself, at last come to feel for them all the interest his readers might be made to feel for objects, with which they are more familiar. If however he should then attempt to excite this interest in others, he will probably not be successful in any proportion to the ability displayed. In many cases he will expose himself to the charge of extravagance, and most likely to ridicule, which if directed against his powers of execution, may be wholly unjustifiable. By neglecting this, we think Mr. Southey has sometimes erred, and particularly in the present poem, which we suppose is by this time too well known to all readers of poetry and reviews to render any particular analysis of it necessary. In reference to it we may say, that few persons are acquainted with the mythology of the Bramins, or have any poetical interest in the inhabitants of Hindostan. Mr. Southey takes into alliance none of our common prejudices, associations, and sentiments; and all the interest which he produces is to be attributed solely to his unassisted powers. But in doing as he has done, he has neglected one means of giving pleasure to others, and securing reputation to himself.

If Homer, instead of founding his immortal poem on the Trojan war, and introducing the gods of his nation, had had recourse to the mythology of Egypt, and celebrated the story of Osiris, we doubt whether his verses would ever have been chanted by the rhapsodists through the cities of Greece, or his name have come down to us as that of the first poet of antiquity. But what is still more unfortunate for Mr. Southey, the better we become acquainted with the gods of India, the more strongly are some feelings produced, which directly counteract his purposes. There is throughout such portentous absurdity in the Hindoo mythology, a destitution of common sense so entire and so utterly inconceivable before hand by any common imagination, that as we are learning its character, we regard it only with continually increasing astonishment and disgust. These feelings must of course be transferred in some degree to every thing connected with it. Mr. Southey himself says; "No figures can be imagined more antipicturesque, and less poetical, than the mythological personages of the Bramins." He adds, that "this deformity was easily kept out of sight." It is true that it is kept out of sight, as far as this could be done, in the poem; but it is not in the power even of Mr. Southey's poetry to expel the recollection of it from the mind of a reader already acquainted with it, or to make us feel any complacency for gods, however represented by him, who we recollect to be a tribe of monsters, with a strange union of mischievous power, and contemptible imbecility. To give one instance to confirm our remark;—Marriataly, the goddess of the poor, and the regard with which she is viewed, and the worship paid to her by Kai-lyal, as described in the poem, are such as to interest the reader; but we really think this interest will be very much destroyed, if one read her private history as given by Mr. Southey himself, in a note to his second canto. Indeed the intrinsic absurdity of the Hindoo superstitions, pervading as it does every part, cannot by any art of the writer be kept out of view in a poem, in which they are so much introduced. The belief, which, as Mr. Southey states, is the foundation of the present poem, is that prayers, penances, sacrifices, &c. have the power of forcing their gifts, and even their own possessions from

the gods; and this without any¹ regard to the character or dispositions of those by whom they are offered or performed.

The subject of this poem has however some things to recommend it, which, in the view of Mr. Southey, probably more than counterbalanced its defects. It affords an opportunity, which he has most successfully employed, for descriptions, novel, striking, splendid and beautiful. Its author, more than any other European poet, has sung *things unattempted yet in prose or verse*.² That there is very much to admire in this poem, cannot be doubted. While we are reading, the scenes which the poet displays may perhaps have their full effect upon our mind. But when we have finished, and laid the book aside, then the wonders of heaven, and earth, and hell, and all the unsubstantial pageant fades from our minds, without leaving any impression of sober pleasure, or permanent complacency.

There is one praise due to Mr. Southey, which we think at some seasons he must feel as of far more value, than any which might be given merely to his powers as a poet. It is, that he has always written in the cause of virtue and goodness; that a strain of high sentiment and correct feeling pervades his works; that no poet has given more interest in his different characters to all the better feelings of our nature. He has often too introduced in the most pleasing manner those hopes and prospects, from which our existence derives all its value. Of the manner in which he thus introduces religious ideas, we will give only two examples, which we happen at the moment to recollect, from the present poem, though something of their interest must be lost by presenting them detached from their connexion.

“ Of human form divine was he,
The immortal youth of heaven who floated by,
Even such as that divinest form shall be
In those blest stages of our onward race,
When no infirmity,
Low thought, nor base desire, nor wasting care,
Deface the semblance of our heavenly sire.” p. 67.

The other is the conclusion of a passage beautiful throughout, though perhaps the sentiment, in what precedes our quotation, is in some degree false. The conclusion is as follows:—

" Oh! when a mother meets on high
 The babe she lost in infancy,
 Hath she not then, for pains and fears,
 The day of woe, the watchful night,
 For all her sorrow, all her tears,
 An over-payment of delight?" pp. 108, 109.

There is no poet, who has written with more uniform purity, with more freedom from every thing, which might corrupt the imagination and debase the feelings.

It is true, there is in Mr. Southey's earlier writings some false sentiments, some extravagances of feelings, and some appearance of a morbid disposition to complaining and discontent. Poets have been too often disposed to derive some splace from the imaginary or real miseries of life, from a consciousness and a display of the *delicacy with which they feel, and the elegance with which they can bewail them*.* We have no doubt of the ill effects of poetry thus written upon readers of much susceptibility, and disposed to gloomy impressions, those alone by whom it will be read with any interest. We have no doubt that it tends to dispirit and enervate the mind and to produce a selfish and indolent melancholy. No delicacy or elegance of expression can change the nature of complaint and repining, and prevent them from being selfish and sinful. It is to the praise of Mr. Southey that we find very little of such poetry in his later writings.

It may be expected, that we should say something of the versification of this poem. It is a very obvious remark, that different kinds of versification are suited to different subjects. If Pope had written his *Rape of the Lock* in blank verse, or Thompson had divided his *Seasons* into couplets, we doubt whether either poem would have obtained a place among our classical writings. We think the versification of the *Curse of Kehama* and of *Thalaba* is, in both poems, adapted better than any other would be to the wildness of their subjects. The purposes of verse are principally two; the one, to produce greater melody than can exist in prose, and the other, to announce the use of modes of thought and expression which in prose would not be allowable. Both these purposes are answered by

* Rasselas.

the versification of the poems just mentioned; the latter completely, the former at least in as great a degree as it ever is in regular blank verse, whatever the admirers of the latter may contend for. There is another incidental pleasure of verse, as it is likewise of all the fine arts, which arises from the perception of difficulty overcome, or of the skill and power of the poet or artist. But we do not think this is ever felt in a great degree from any kind of verse except from rhyme.

With regard to the little collection of poems, whose title is prefixed to our review, many of them are ludicrous and burlesque, and in these we do not think Mr. Southey always very successful. Of the serious pieces however, some have great beauty, and display those soft and mellow shades of feeling, which give so much interest to many of Mr. Southey's productions. We will extract only one of the serious poems, which, though it may not have any great poetical merit, we think very pleasing.

" You are old, Father William, the young man cried,
The few locks which are left you are grey;
You are hale, Father William, a hearty old man,
Now tell me the reason, I pray.

In the days of my youth, Father William replied,
I remembered that youth would fly fast;
And abused not my health and my vigor at first,
That I never might need them at last.

You are old, Father William, the young man cried,
And pleasures with youth pass away,
And yet you lament not the days that are gone,
Now tell me the reason, I pray.

In the days of my youth, Father William replied,
I remembered that youth could not last;
I thought of the future whatever I did,
That I never might grieve for the past.

You are old, Father William, the young man cried,
And life must be hastening away;
You are cheerful, and love to converse upon death!
Now tell me the reason, I pray.

I am cheerful, young man, Father William replied,
 Let the cause thy attention engage;
 In the days of my youth I remembered my God!
 And He hath not forgotten my age." pp. 147, 148,

There are various other minor poems of Mr. Southey, besides those contained in the present volume, which we should be pleased to see republished.

FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

(Selected principally from the latest British publications which have been received as far as to those for January, inclusive.)

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

BIOGRAPHE Moderne, or lives of remarkable characters, who have distinguished themselves from the commencement of the French revolution to the present time, in which all the facts that concern them are related in the most impartial and authentic manner. From the French, 8 vols. [A review of the original of this work sometime since appeared in the *Edinburgh Review*, which has been attributed to our distinguished countryman, Mr. Walsh.]

Memoirs of the Life of Prince Potemkin, Field Marshal in the service of Russia, during the reign of the Empress Catharine; containing numerous anecdotes hitherto unpublished, in 4 vol. 8vo. with a portrait. 9s.

Memoirs of the latter years of the life of the Rt. Hon. Charles James Fox. By J. B. Trotter, Esq. his private secretary. 14s. [The first large edition of this work, says the *Monthly Magazine*, was sold in a few days; a new one was printed with great expedition, and bespoke before it was ready; and another is preparing to meet the impatient demands of the public. The free and honest estimate, it is likewise said, which Mr. Trotter has made from personal knowledge of the principles and pretensions of the heads of parties, has greatly increased the interest of his work. Mr. Trotter has in preparation an account of the whole life of Fox.]

A view of the present state of Sicily: its rural economy, population, and produce, particularly in the county of Modica. With

an appendix containing observations on its general character, climate, and resources. By Thomas Wright Vaughan, Esq. 4to. 4l. 11s. 6d. boards.

The lives of John Selden, and Archbishop Usher, with notices of the principal Englishmen of letters, with whom they were connected. By J. Aikin, M. D. 10s. 6d.

A concise history of the Moors in Spain, from their invasion of that kingdom to their final expulsion from it. By Thomas Bourke, Esq. 4to. 4l. 1s.

Travels in Greece, Palestine, Egypt, and Barbary, during the years 1806 and 1807. By F. A. De Chateaubriand. Translated from the French, 2 vols. 8vo. 4l. 4s.

A journey through Persia, Armenia, and Asia Minor, to Constantinople, in the years 1808 and 1809. By James Morier, Esq. 4to. with 25 plates, 3l. 18s. 6d. boards.

An account of the trigonometrical survey carried on by order of the Master General of his Majesty's ordinance; in the years 1800, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8. By Lt. Col. Mudge, of the royal artillery, F. R. S. and Capt. Thomas Colby, of the royal engineers. Vol. III. 4to. 2l. 2s.

The third and concluding volume of Parkinson's Organic remains of a former world; with 53 coloured plates representing nearly 400 fossil specimens. 4to. 3l. 18s. 6d.

Petrology, or a treatise on rocks. By John Pinkerton, Esq. author of modern geography, &c. With 25 engravings, 2 vols. 8vo. 2l. 2s.

Historical reflections on the constitution and representative system of England, with reference to the popular propositions for a reform in Parliament. By James Jopp, Esq. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Substance of two speeches by the Rt. Hon. N. Vansittart on the report of the Bullion Committee.

Substance of a speech delivered as above by the Rt. Hon. George Rose.

A view of the policy and interest of the United States. 4s.

Observations on the present state of the Portuguese army as organized by Lt. Gen. Sir William Carr Beresford K. B. By Andrew Halliday, M. D. 15s.

Col. Pickering's Letters to the people of the United States on the conduct of the past and present administrations of the American government toward Great Britain and France, have been collected and republished in England.

The eleventh volume of the Asiatic researches.

Select letters of Tippoo Sultan to various public functionaries. Arranged and translated by William Kirkpatrick, colonel in the service of the honorable East India Company, with notes, &c. 4to. 2l. 2s. 6d.

A grammar of the Persian language, comprising a portion of the elements of Arabic inflection, together with some observations on the structure of either language, considered with reference to the principles of general grammar. By M. Lumsden, LL. D. professor of Arabic and Persian in the college of Fort William in Bengal, 2 vols. foolscap folio. 4l. 4s.

A dictionary of the Malayan language, in two parts, Malayan and English, and English and Malayan. By William Marsden, F. R. S. author of the history of Sumatra, 4to, 2l. 2s. Mr. Marsden is likewise about to publish a grammar of the Malayan language.

The second volume of a prose translation from the Sanscrit of The Ramayuna of Valmeeki, with explanatory notes, in quarto, containing 523 pages, has been published at Serampore, by William Carey and Joshua Marshman. [It appears to be the settled intention of the missionaries, say the Eclectic Reviewers, to translate the whole of this enormous poem, though no less than eight volumes must follow the present one to accomplish the purpose. In the advertisement to the work it is stated, that Sir J. Anstruther, the late president of the Asiatic Society, indicated a wish to the society of missionaries at Serampore, that they would undertake the work of translating such of the Sanscrit writings, as a committee formed from the Asiatic Society and college of Fort William should deem worthy of the public notice. It was proposed accordingly to print in the original, accompanied by a translation as nearly literal as the genius of the two languages would admit, the principal works found in the Sanscrit, particularly those that are held sacred by the Hindoos, or those, which may be most illustrative of their manners, their history, or their religion, including also the principal works of science. The committee made choice of the Ramayuna of Valmeeki, to be the first in the series of translations. "The reverence in which it is held, the extent of country, through which it is circulated, and the interesting view, which it exhibits of the religion, the doctrines, the mythology, the current ideas, and the

manners and customs of the Hindoos, combine to justify the selection." The basis of the story is the birth, life, and adventures of Rama, who is an incarnation of the god Vishnu. The story is said to be a formless jumble. It is represented by the Eclectic Reviewers as utterly worthless on the score of genius, wisdom, or common sense, and as deriving its only value from the illustrations which it affords of the state of understanding, of the notions and of the manners of an ancient and remote people. "In the descriptive remarks we have made," say they, "we have been able to give but an extremely feeble idea of the surpassing excess of absurdity, which prevails throughout the production, which is really worth any one's reading, who cares to see the *maximum* of that quality." The first volume of this work is reviewed likewise in the fourth number of the Quarterly Review, where a similar character of it is given. It is one of the two sacred epics of the Hindoos; the other is called the Mahabarat. A translation of a part of the latter was published by Mr. Wilkins in 1785, under the title of "The Bhagvat Geeta, or dialogues of Khrisna and Arjoon, in eighteen lectures, with notes: translated from the original in the Sanscrit or ancient language of the Bramins." It is said to be "one of the most important, and in some respects the most rational of the irrational Puranas." The same work translated into French, through the medium of the Tansul and Persian, was published at Paris in 1788. Epitomes with large extracts from two others of the Puranas have appeared in English. Mr. Wilkins is said to be preparing a translation of the whole of the Mahabarat. The Institutes of Menu, which is one of the Dhermas, or works of law, containing a system of moral and religious duties, and which is held in high veneration by the Hindoos, has been translated by Sir William Jones. Sacountala, a sacred drama, and some odes from the Sanscrit have likewise been translated by him. Some extracts from the Vedas have been translated, through the medium of the Persian, into French, by Anquetil Du Perron, which were published at Paris in two volumes quarto, with notes; and into English by Mr. Halhed, whose translation is deposited in the British museum. In 1777 was published, "A code of Gentoo laws, or ordinations of the Pundits. From a Persian translation, made from the original, written in the Sanscrit language." The code was compiled from the Vedas and other authentic books, by Bramins assembled at Cal-

cutta by Mr. Hastings. The translation from the Persian was made by Mr. Halhed. A complete copy of the Vedas, which is with difficulty obtained even in India, has been procured by Col. Polier, and presented to the British museum. These, as it is well known, are the most sacred books of the Hindoos. They treat of the rites and duties of religion, and contain prayers and hymns to their various deities, with the occasional introduction of mythology. Beside these are the Upavedas, which treat of different arts and sciences; the Vedangas, which are six; three relating to grammar, one to explanation of difficult phrases in the Vedas, one to religious ceremonies, and one to astronomy; the Upangas, of which the most important are the Puranas, a series of mythological histories in blank verse; one of which is the Mahabarat above mentioned, and probably the Ramayana. To this last class seem likewise to be referred the Dharmaas, or books on law. "The sacred books of the Bramins," say the Quarterly Reviewers, (*Review of Sanscrit Grammars in first number*) "have long been mentioned with solemn wonder, which would still have misled the public if the translations and extracts from them, which have successively appeared, had not discovered their puerility and imposture."}]

Conferences between the Danish missionaries resident at Tranquebar, and the heathen natives of Hindoostan, translated from an original manuscript by a gentleman in the service of the honorable East India Company.

The works of Confucius, containing the original text with a translation, to which is prefixed a dissertation on the Chinese language and character. By J. Marsham, 4to. 5l. 6s. boards. printed at Serampore. [This work has been issued from the missionary press at Serampore, in Bengal: it is printed in the Chinese character, with a translation, which refers by numbers over each sentence to the corresponding words of the Chinese text, and is accompanied with an ample commentary.]

Van der Hooght's Hebrew Bible is republishing in England by Rev. Joseph Samuel C. F. Frey. It is to be completed in 12 parts, each containing 128 pages 8vo. common 6s. 8d. royal 7s. 6d. Two parts have appeared. [The editorial labors of Mr. Frey, say the Eclectic Reviewers, deserve high commendation. "The difficulty of printing Hebrew correctly with the points and all the accents, is known to be so great as to be next to impracticable

with even the best English composers. Mr. Frey therefore has wisely engaged Jewish composers, who from their childhood were trained up to a familiarity with the punctuated and accented Hebrew. He himself carefully revises every word and mark by the Bible of Salomon Proops, which the Jews consider the most accurate ever published; and he has engaged another converted Jew, who is an accomplished Hebraist, on the Masoretic plan, to assist him in the vast toil of correcting. By these means he has detected an unexpected number of errors in Van der Hooght's original edition."—Van der Hooght's text is well known as that adopted by Kennicott, to which he has accommodated his various readings.]

The Literary and Philosophical Society of Hackney has published the first year's report of its proceedings and a catalogue of the library.

Lectures on the pastoral character. By the late George Campbell, D. D. &c. edited by James Frazer, D. D. &c. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

An entire new version of the book of Psalms, in which an attempt is made to accommodate them to the worship of the Christian church. By the Rev. William Goode, M. A.

Letters to a Friend on the evidences, doctrines, and duties of the Christian religion. By Olinthus Gregory, L. L. D. of the Royal Academy, Woolwich, 2 vols. 8vo. 14s. boards.

Love to Christ, a discourse delivered at Coventry, June 11, 1844, before the Unitarian Tract Society, established in Birmingham for Hardwickshire and the neighboring counties. By James Hews Bransby.

A vindication of Dr. Bell's system of tuition, in a series of letters. By Herbert Marsh, D. D. F. R. S. &c. 8vo.

An analysis of a new system of education; in which the Lancastrian principles are discussed and enlarged in a project for the erection of a grand public academy at Glasgow, 8vo. 10s. 6d. half bound.

Third report of the committee of the London Society for promoting Christianity among the Jews.

Report of the Society for preventing wanton cruelty to animals, instituted at Liverpool, October 1809.

Etymologian Universale; or Universal Etymological Dictionary, by W. Whiter, 4to. vol. I. Parts I, and II. 4l. 4s.

Declaration against the Pope's supremacy. Written by his majesty Edward VI, in the year 1549. Republished and dedicated to his majesty George III, by the Rev. John Duncan, LL.D. F. A. S.

The dedication of the *Biblia Polyglotta* to king Charles II, by Brian Walton, reprinted from a fine original copy just imported, folio, 7s.

De la Literature considerée dans ses rapports avec les institutions sociales. Par Madame de Stael Holstein. *Precedé de Memoire sur la Vie de l'Auteur.* 2 vols. 14s.

Anecdotes of the manners and customs of London, from the Roman invasion to the year 1700, including the origin of British society, customs, and manners; with a general sketch of the state of religion during that period, with eighteen engravings. By James Peller Malcolm, F. S. A. 3 vols. 8vo. 2l. 2s.

Histoire des Femmes Françoise, les plus celebres, et de leur influence sur la literature, &c. Par Mad. de Genlis, 2 vols. 12mo.

Londina Illustrata, with plates, No. XI.

The Milesian, a romance. By the author of the *Fatal Revenge, and the Wild Irish Boy.* 4 vols. 12mo. 1l. 1s.

Une Macedoine. Par Pigault Le Brun, Auteur De *Monsieur Botte, Mon Oncle Thomas, &c.*

Four volumes of a selection of articles from the *Gentleman's Magazine* have been published in 8vo.

Marie Menzekop et Feden Dalgrouki Histoire Russe; traduite par Mad. de Montolieu, 3 vols. 12mo. 15s.

The Caledonian Banditti, or Heir of Duncaethal, a romance, by Mrs. Smith, 3 vols. 16s. 6d.

The Political Review and Monthly Mirror of the times, No. I. to be continued Monthly. 2s.

The Curse of Kehama. 2d edition.

The Polish game of Draughts, illustrated by a variety of curious situations. By J. G. Polman, Esq. 2s.

Extracts from the diary of a lover of literature. By T. Green Esq.

Instinct displayed in a collection of well authenticated facts; exemplifying the extraordinary sagacity of various species of the animal creation. By P. Wakefield.

Poems by S. T. Coleridge, Esq.

Essay on a Punie inscription. By the Rt. Hon. Sir William

Drummond. royal 4to. 1l. 14s. 6d. Sir William Drummond conceives he has discovered in Malta the burial place of Hannibal. He adduces several reasons for thinking, that although Hannibal fell in Bithynia by the perfidy of the king Prusias and the Roman general Flaminius, yet his ashes were brought from thence to repose among his countrymen and relations at Malta. It appears in the year 1761, in the district of Ben Ghisa in Malta was discovered a sepulchral cave. In the wall of this cave was a hollow square, in which was cut in Pheucian characters an epitaph, which Sir William has translated thus:

The inner chambers of the sanctuary
of the sepulchre of Hannibal;
Illustrious in the consummation of calamity,
He was beloved.
The people lament, when arrayed
in order of battle,
Hannibal, the son of Bar Melech.

Monthly Magazine.

WORKS ANNOUNCED.

Mr. Alexander Chalmers, the correct and industrious editor of many London editions of English authors, is engaged in a new edition of his Biographical Dictionary in octavo, which is to be enlarged from sixteen to twenty one volumes. [The dictionary we suppose here referred to, is one first published 1765, by W. Owen and W. Johnston, booksellers; and afterwards 1784 in 12 vols. 8vo.]

The proprietors of the London edition of Johnson's dictionary have engaged Mr. Todd to supply its deficiencies for a new edition. Four thousand words, it is said, will be added.

A new edition of Shakspeare's plays, with notes selected from Mr. Stevens' edition. By Mr. A. Chalmers, in 9 vols. 8vo.

Mr. Southey has nearly ready for publication, *Omniana*, in a duodecimo volume. Likewise a poem entitled *Pelayo*, the restorer of Spain.

Among the valuable MSS. in the oriental library Montebasino (in Italy) a Greek MS. of Apollonius Evander (nephew to Apollonius of Rhodes) has recently been discovered. In this MS. is contained among other interesting subjects a detailed account of the eruption of Vesuvius in the reign of Titus. A learned Hellenist is about to publish the work with a translation.

The learned world, says the *British Critic* for October, will

rejoice to hear that the first volume of Mr. Davy's elements of the philosophy of chemistry will soon be published.

Outlines of a course of natural philosophy. Part I. By Professor Playfair, F. R. S. Lond. and Edin. 1 vol. 8vo.

The second part of Dr. Clarke's travels is in the press, and will comprehend Greece, Syria, and Egypt.

Dr. Irvine announces a volume of letters on Sicily.

The views of France relative to England have lately been developed in a pamphlet of M. de Montgaillard, a member of the French government, published under the auspices of the Emperor. A copy has reached London and a translation will appear in a few days. Nothing more important in political information has appeared for a long time.

The Rev. William Coxe has in the press in two 4to volumes memoirs of the kings of Spain from 1700 to 1788, with an introduction relative to the government and state of Spain.

A translation of Chateaubriand's spirit of Christianity, by Mr. Shoberl, is in the press.

The Rev. Dr. Toulmin is preparing a sequel to Neal's history of the Puritans, which is intended to embrace the latest possible period.

The Rev. T. Rees is translating from the Latin the Racovian catechism, to which is prefixed a brief history of the Polish unitarian churches, for whose use it was composed.

The Rev. J. Joyce is preparing a collection of curious and scientific opinions on the subject of comets.

A third volume of Bishop Horsley's sermons is nearly ready for publication.

We rejoice to hear, says the British Critic, that Mr. Horsley is preparing a new edition of his father's excellent tracts against Priestley, which have been long out of print, and much sought by clergy and others. This edition will be enriched with observations on various parts of the controversy, written by bishop Horsley himself, on the margin of the former edition. Mr. Horsley intends also to publish some observations either as notes or in the form of an appendix, on Mr. Belsham's review of the controversy. In the mean time the public are cautioned against a spurious edition, which, if it cannot be stopped by precept, is proceeding in the very town where Mr. Horsley lives, Dundee, but cannot possibly have the additions. [We rejoice likewise, that these tracts are about to be republished. We are glad that

the attention of the public is again to be called to this controversy, on account of its great importance, and because we think its results have been misrepresented with an hardihood of assertion almost unparalleled. This misrepresentation has been partly owing to the ignorant being imposed upon by the very confident manner of Dr. Horsley, and partly to the necessity upon the supporters of the church establishment in England to maintain the truth of what he defended.]

[In the writings of the Rev. Dr. BUCHANAN an account is given of a MS. Hebrew copy of the Books of Moses, which that enterprising and inquisitive traveller found among the black Jews in the interior of India. It is written on a roll of leather. The skins are sewed together, and the roll is about forty eight feet in length. It is, in some places, worn out, and the holes have been sewed up with pieces of parchment. This ancient, and doubtless, highly valuable, MS. has been collated by Mr. Yeates, of Cambridge in England, and is about to be printed in a quarto volume, at the expense of the University of Cambridge. Dr. Marsh, the learned editor of *Michaelis*, has written a note on the antiquity and importance of the MS. which will form a preface to the work. To those of our readers, who have a taste for biblical literature, it will be gratifying to know, that there is a prospect of the extension of the benefit of this valuable work to America, by donation, as soon as it shall be published.]

LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS

FOR JANUARY, FEBRUARY, AND MARCH, 1812.

N. B. All notices of works published, or proposed to be published, which may be forwarded to the publisher of this work, free of expense, shall be inserted in this list.

NEW WORKS.

Works to which an asterisk is prefixed are in the *Athenæum*, Boston.

*A TREATISE on bridge architecture, in which the superiour advantages of the flying pendant lever bridge are fully proved. With an historical account and description of different bridges erected in different parts of the world, from an early period down to the present time. By Thomas Pope, architect and landscape gardener. N. York, Alexander Niven, pp. 288, 8vo.

A new treatise on the globes and practical astronomy, or a comprehensive view of the system of the world, intended as an introduction to the higher branches of astronomy and natural philosophy. By James Wallace, member of the New-York Literary Institution, [This work has just come

to hand. It appears to contain a great deal of interesting matter collected from the best sources.]

* The first number of the New England journal of medicine and surgery, to be continued quarterly. Boston, T. B. Wait & Co. pp. 112.

* A letter addressed to a republican member of the house of representatives on the subject of a petition for a new corporation, to be entitled 'A college of physicians.' Boston.

* A sketch of the history of Maryland, during the three first years after its settlement: to which is prefixed a copious introduction, by John L. Bozman. Baltimore, Edward J. Coale, pp. 387, 8vo.

The chronicle; or an annual view of history, politics, and literature, foreign and domestic. Baltimore, A. Millenberger.

* History of the Jews, by Hannah Adams. Boston, John Eliot jun. 2 vol. 12mo.

An historical sketch of the first church in Boston, from its foundation to the present period, with two sermons. By the late William Emerson, A. M. A. A. S. Boston, Munroe & Francis.

A sketch of the military system of France; comprising some observations on the character and designs of the French government; to which is added an inquiry into the probable duration of the French power. Baltimore, E. J. Coale: price \$0 cents.

A letter to a member of congress, on the subject of a British war. Boston, West & Richardson.

* Mr. Lloyd's speech on the naval establishment. Boston, Russell & Cutler.

The speech of the Hon. Josiah Quincy, on the bill for establishing a navy. Boston, Russell & Cutler, 20 cents.

* Report of contested elections in the house of representatives of the commonwealth of Massachusetts. Boston, True & Rowe.

* Message of His Ex'y Gov. Gerry and report of the attorney and solicitor generals, on libels. Boston, Chronicle office.

Massachusetts term reports, vol. 6. Boston, E. Little & Co.

An abridgement of the laws of Pennsylvania from 1700 to 1811. By John Purdon jun. Esq. Phil. Hopkins, Farrand, Zantzinger & Co.

Laws of Massachusetts from Feb. 28, 1807 to June 23, 1811, vol. I. new series; beginning where the edition published by order of the legislature in 1807 ends. 32 boards. Boston, Thomas & Andrews. [This volume is published in boards, that the laws of each political year which will be published annually, in an uniform manner, may be bound up with it.]

* Opinion of the court, delivered at the meeting and sitting of the judges at Charleston, at the conclusion of the spring circuits in the year 1811; in conformity with the 3d section of the 10th article of the constitution of the state of South Carolina: on a motion for a new trial on behalf of colonel Ihre, who had been convicted of publishing a libel; with preliminary remarks by a member of the bar.

The elements of war. By Isaac Minkby, brigadier general in the fourth Massachusetts division. Boston.

* Report of the agent of the Middlesex canal corporation to the proprietors, on the business done in the year 1811 &c. made at their meeting Jan. 30, 1812.

* Calamity at Richmond, being a narrative of the circumstances attending the conflagration of the theatre in the city of Richmond, on the night of Thursday, 26th Dec. 1811, by which more than seventy persons lost their lives—collected from various letters, publications, and official reports. Philad. John F. Watson, pp. 56, 12mo, 25 cents.

A very full and interesting narrative of the conflagration of the theatre at Richmond, Virginia. Boston, Bradford & Reed. 25 cents.

A monody on the victims and sufferers by the late conflagration in the city of Richmond, Virginia. By S. Gilman. Boston, Williams.

A sermon by the Rev. Dr. Alexander on the occasion of the fire at Richmond; delivered at the request of the young gentlemen from Virginia and other students at the university. Philadelphia, Hopkins, Farrand, Zantzeinger, & Co.

A sermon on the occasion of the fire at Richmond, delivered at the request of the young gentlemen of New York; by Samuel Miller, D.D. N. York, T. & J. Swords.

* A discourse on the occasion of the fire at Richmond, delivered by request of the young men of Boston. By the Rev. Mr. Sabin. Boston, James Scott.

Comments on Romans ix. Being an attempt to ascertain the meaning of that difficult portion of Scripture, in two discourses, delivered at Lisbon, Con. August 1811. By Andrew Lee D. D. pastor of the north church in that town. Norwich, Russel Hubbard.

* Sermons to Mariners, by Abiel Abbot, A. M. pastor of the first church in Beverly. Boston, Samuel T. Armstrong, pp. 275, 12mo, \$1.

* A Sermon, delivered before the Society for propagating the Gospel among the Indians and others in North America, at their anniversary, November 7, 1811. By James Kendall, A. M. minister of the first church in Plymouth. Boston, John Eliot, jun.

Dr. Griffin's Charity Sermon, preached at Roxbury, before the Charitable Society, and at Portsmouth, N. H. for the benefit of the Female Asylum in that town. Boston, 12½ cents.

An address delivered before the Wiscasset Female Asylum October 8, 1811. Being their first public meeting after the act of incorporation. By Alden Bradford. Hallowell, Nathaniel Cheever.

* A sermon preached in the meeting house of the Baptist Society in Salem, on Lord's day evening, Jan. 26, 1812, for the benefit of the translations of the Scriptures into the languages of India and China, with an Appendix including remarks on president Smith's observations on foreign missions. By William Johns, missionary to India. Published by request. The profits of the work will go in aid of the translations. Boston, Lincoln & Edmonds.

* A sermon delivered at the Tabernacle in Salem, Feb. 6, 1812, on account of the ordination of the Rev. Messrs. Newell, Judson, Hall,

and Rice, missionaries to the heathen in Asia. By Leonard Woods, D. D. Abbot professor of Christian Theology, in the Theological seminary in Andover. To which is prefixed an introduction, giving some account of the rise and progress of the American mission. Boston, Samuel T. Armstrong, \$2 per dozen, 20 cents single.

A reply to Mr. Abbot's statement of proceedings in the first society of Coventry, Con. By the association of Toland county. Hartford, Gleason.

Scriptural investigations, contained in letters and sketches of sermons on the subject of the great salvation. By John Murray, senior pastor of the first universal society in Boston, Vol. I. Boston.

* An oration in commemoration of the birth day of our illustrious Washington, pronounced at Windsor, Feb. 24, 1812, before the Washington Benevolent Society. By Josiah Dunham. Published at the request of the society. Windsor. Vt. Thomas M. Pumroy.

Reflections, notes, and original anecdotes illustrating the character of Peter the Great; to which is added a tragedy in five acts, entitled Alexis the Czarewicz. By Alexis Eutaphieue. Boston, Munroe & Francis.

The Polyanthos, No. 1. to be continued monthly: Boston, J. T. Buckingham.

* Miscellaneous Poems, on moral and religious subjects;—by Osander Hudson, William E. Norman. 12mo. pp. 180.

* The American captive, or siege of Tripoli, a drama in 5 acts. By James Ellison. Boston, J. Belcher.

* The reporter, a partial imitation of the second book of Horace. Washington, S. Snowden. pp 14, 4to.

A collection of American epitaphs and inscriptions, with occasional notes. By Timothy Alden, A. M. No. 1, vol. 1, 25 cts New York, Whiting & Watson. [From sixteen to twenty numbers are intended.]

The diocesan register for 1812, containing among other things a memoir of the late Hon. Fisher Ames, with a view to correct some of the mistakes published in the Panoplist respecting his religious tenets. Dedham, H. Mann. 50 cents.

NEW EDITIONS.

American Works.

* A second edition of Walsh's Letter on the genius and disposition of the present government of France. Boston, Bradford and Read, 75 cents. History of the American Revolution. By David Ramsay, M. D. 2 vols.

Orations on the fourth of March, delivered at the request of the inhabitants of Boston, by the following gentlemen: Mr. James Lovell, Dr. Joseph Warren, Dr. Benjamin Church, John Hancock, Esq. Thomas Dawes, jun. Esq. Jonathan W. Austin, Esq. William Tudor, Esq. Jonathan Mason jun. G. R. Minot, Dr. Thomas Welch, and Perez Morton, Esq. To which is added a poem, by the late James Allen, Esq. Boston, William T. Clap.

The system of doctrines contained in divine Revelation, explained and

defended; shewing their consistence and connexion with each other. To which is added a treatise on the millennium, by Samuel Hopkins, D. D. second edition, 2 vols 8vo. Boston, Lincoln & Edmands, \$5.

The American builder's companion or a system of architecture, particularly adapted to the present style of building. By Asher Benjamin, architect and carpenter. Second edition, corrected and enlarged. Boston.

The arithmetical part of the late president Webber's course of mathematics, intended for the use of academies and schools, as a preparatory study for admission into the University. Cambridge, Hilliard & Metcalf.

Foreign Works.

The first number of the new Edinburgh encyclopædia, conducted by D. Brewster, LL. D. Philadelphia, Parker & Delaplaine.

* Sketches of the internal state of France, by M. Faber, translated from the French. Philadelphia, J. & A. Y. Humphreys. 12mo. pp. 256.

Shée's rhymes on art. Philadelphia, J. F. Watson.

* Constance de Castile, a poem in ten cantos, by William Sotheby, Esq. translator of "Oberon." Boston, West & Blake.

English bards and Scotch reviewers; a satire. By lord Byron. 1 vol. Philadelphia, \$1.

Poetry for children, entirely original, by the author of "Mrs. Leicester's school." Boston, 62½ cents.

Works of Peter Pindar, with an index, and some account of his life, 4 vols 24mo. Boston, C. Williams. boards, \$5.

The maniac, and other poems, by John Lawson, missionary to India. Philadelphia.

Shakspeare's plays, a third edition similar to their former editions is now publishing by Munroe & Francis, in numbers.

A new medical work, on the *organic diseases and lesions* of the heart and large vessels, by J. N. Corvisart, professor of the school of medicine at Paris, and physician to the emperor; translated from the French, with notes, by Jacob Gates, M. M. S. Boston, Bradford & Read. The Reviewers at Paris speak thus of the work; "Professor Corvisart justly merits the thanks of the profession, for first calling the attention of the faculty to this subject; and has the honor of having removed the obscurity, in which it had been enveloped by substituting proof for conjecture. These diseases now merit our most profound research; as an accurate knowledge of them is intimately blended with the powers of professional usefulness."

* *Thinks-I-to-myself*, a serio-ludicro, tragico-comico tale, written by *Thinks-I-to-myself*, who? two volumes in one; first American from the fourth London edition. Boston, Lincoln & Edmands; published by Bradford & Read. A second edition is in the press by the above publishers.

The forest of Montalbano, in four volumes, by the author of *Santo Sebastiano*, and the *Romance of the Pyrenees*. Bakimoro, Philip H. Nicklin. \$4.

A treatise on the process employed by nature in suppressing the horn-

orrage from divided or punctured arteries, &c. by J. F. D. Jones, D. Member of the royal college of surgeons, London. Philadelphia, Dobson, boards, \$2,25.

Surgical observations on the injuries of the head and on miscellaneous subjects, by John Abernethy, F. R. S. Philadelphia, Dobson. boards \$1.

A treatise on ruptures, by William Lawrence, member of the royal college of surgeons, demonstrator of anatomy at St. Bartholomew's Hospital, with an appendix, by Joseph Parrish, M. D. Philadelphia, E. Parker.

A dissertation on the use and abuse of tobacco, by Adam Clark, LL.D. second American edition. Newburyport, Thomas & Whipple.

The naval gazetteer, or seaman's complete guide, by John Malham; greatly improved from the first American edition. 2 vols. 8vo. \$7.

Mnemonika, or Tablet of memory. Baltimore, E. J. Coals.

An introduction to the geography of the New Testament, comprising a summary chronological and geographical view of the events recorded, with maps. By Lant Carpenter, D. D. Cambridge, Hilliard & Metcalf.

A course of lectures, containing a description and systematic arrangement of the several branches of divinity, accompanied with an account both of the principal authors and of the progress which has been made at different times in theological learning. By Herbert Marsh, D. D. F. R. S. Margaret professor of divinity, &c. Part i. pp. 112. 8vo. Cambridge, Hilliard & Metcalf. The second part is in the press.

The nature, extent, and province of human reason considered. This work was written by several clergymen belonging to the diocese of Bishop Horsley, and is dedicated to his lordship. "Take heed that the light which is in thee be not darkness." Boston.

The complete works of Dr. Claudius Buchanan. Boston, Armstrong, \$2 50. A new edition of the same is preparing to be sold at \$1.

Buchanan's Christian researches &c. (containing the whole of his publications and Horne's sermon). New York, Whiting & Watson, 12mo.

The life of Brainerd, missionary to the Indians; with an epitome of his diary and journal. By John Styles, author of an essay on the stage. Boston, \$1.

Scott's bible has been published to the third volume.

The book of common prayer according to the use of the episcopal church in America. Boston, Williams.

An abridgement of Murray's English grammar. Worcester, I. Thomas.

Mavor's cat-chisms in 8 numbers for children. Boston, Belcher.

True stories, or interesting anecdotes of young persons, designed through the medium of example to inculcate principles of virtue and piety. Philadelphia, \$1.

Liber facetiarum, being a collection of curious and interesting anecdotes. Suavis et vehementer saepe utilis locus. Cic. Boston, Williams.

The vocal companion, consisting of songs, duets, glees, catches, canzons, and canzonets, selected from the most eminent European authors. Boston, Buckingham.

Works in the press or proposed to be published.

A. Croswell proposes to publish a translation of La Lande's abridgement of his treatise on astronomy in 1 vol. 8vo. about pp. 600, with 16 plates. \$4. Subscriptions received at the different bookstores.

The lectures, corrected and improved, which have been delivered for a series of years in the college of New Jersey on the subjects of moral and political philosophy. By the Rev. S. S. Smith, D. D. L. L. D. D. Fenton, Trenton.

The poems and other miscellaneous writings of the late R. T. Paine jun. Esq. Boston, J. Belcher. 1 vol. 8vo. \$3 boards.

The life of the late Gen. W. Eaton. Baltimore, E. J. Coale.

Specimens of American and European eloquence, 3 vols. Baltimore, J. Kinston.

Biographiana, or anecdotes of distinguished persons. By W. Seward. Boston, E. C. Beals. 1 vol. 8vo. \$2 boards.

The complete works of Dr. S. Johnson, collected and edited by J. Abercrombie, D. D. containing many pieces of Johnson's hitherto omitted in his works. Philadelphia, J. & A. Y. Humphreys.

Shakespeare's plays. A pocket edition, with plates. New-York, M. & W. Ward.

Shakespeare's plays. Six volumes 24mo. \$6. Also in one volume 8vo. on the same type, \$5. Boston, Charles Williams & Joseph T. Buckingham.

Shakespeare's plays. Ayscough's edition, with his notes. To be published in 36 Nos. at 37½ cts. each No. with his life in an extra number, which will form two 8vo volumes. Boston, J. & L. Edwards.

It is worthy of notice that there are proposals for four editions of Shakespeare's plays, while one is now publishing in Boston, which is the third edition by the same publishers within a few years. We wish much to see proposals for an edition of his works with the notes of the commentators complete, or for Mr. Chalmers's edition about to be published.

EDITOR'S NOTICE.

THERE has been an excess in our Theological Departments in the present volume, but it will be observed that there has been no deficiency in any other department, and that both numbers have exceeded the limits proposed. It is intended that there shall always be something in the Theological departments of future numbers, which will be interesting to all readers.

A meteorological journal kept at the university in this place will be commenced for the present year in the next number.

The communication on the Chinese manuscripts, and also the verses to a child, will appear in the next number.

Communications which are not published or not noticed in the number which appears next after they are received will not be published.

It is requested that all communications should be furnished as early as six weeks before the time of issuing the number, in which it is intended they should be inserted.

We are requested by our publishers to mention, that the next number will be printed on a new type.

INDEX.

A

- Abbot's* Statement reviewed 146. Mr. Abbot's conduct with respect to his church ib. Sectarian spirit prevalent 147. Proceedings of his church 148. Advice to ministers 154. Intolerance of many among us 158. Character of Mr. Abbot's book 160.
- Account* of books contained in the Library of Harvard College. Complutensian Polyglot 337. Antwerp Polyglot 333. Paris Polyglot 333. London Polyglot with Castell's Lexicon 337.
- Anacreon*. See *Moore*.
- Analecta* 130.
- Arkansas* river. See *Pike*.

B

- Bible* News. See *Worcester*.
- Bowdoin* prize questions 212.
- Bowditch's* calculations of the orbits of the comets of 1807 and 1811 190.

C

- Carpenter's* geography and chronology of the New Testament reviewed. Character of the geographical part 424. Account of the second part and his new system of an harmony of the four gospels 427. Remarks on the question, whether the evangelists wrote in the order of time 428. Objections to the opinion that they did 429. John's gospel not in chronological order 430. Matthew the only guide as to the times of events 433. The duration of the ministry, Ireneus', and Sir I. Newton's opinions considered ib. Other opinions noticed 434. The opinion of one year's duration defended. Objections removed 435. Arguments in favor of 437. Dr. Carpenter's arrangement of events 440.
- Chronology* of the New Testament. See *Carpenter*.
- Comets*, Prof. Winthrop's lectures and Oliver's essays upon, reviewed 162. Ancient opinions concerning comets 161. Sir Isaac Newton's opinion 162. Comet of 1680 163. Halley's prediction of the return of the comet of 1682 164. Elements of the orbits of comets 168. Tails of comets 170. Mr. Oliver's opinion concerning them 171. The nature of comets 175. Their magnitude 176. Their use 178. Their habitability 181. Comets shown to be not likely to interfere with the earth 187. Elements of the orbits of the comets of 1807 and 1811 190.
- Constance* de Castile reviewed. See *Sotheby*.
- Controversy* between Dr. Priestley, Bishop Horsley, and others, account of Works in which it is contained 26. Analysis of the first part of Priestley's history of Corruptions 30. Notice of this work by the Monthly Reviewer, Mr. Badcock 37. Horsley's charges 38. Character of Horsley 40. Character of Priestley 42. Quotations from the apostolic fathers in support of Christ's divinity 44. Opinion of Semler as to the gen.

uneness of the writings ascribed to the apostolic fathers 55. Question as to identity of the Nazarenes and Ebionites examined. General view of Dr. Priestley's arguments on this question 230. Quotations on this subject from Epiphanius 237. Jerom 246. Austin 250. Origen 252. Whether a church of orthodox Jews ever existed at Jerusalem, i. e. *Ælia Capitolina* 253. Veracity of Origen 269. Inference from the identity of the Nazarenes and Ebionites 272.
Convex lenses of the ancients 125.
Curse of Kehama reviewed 443.

D

Dexter fund at Harvard college for the promotion of sacred criticism 204.

E

Emerson's history of the first church in Boston reviewed. Account of the book 354. Character and account of Nortop, one of the ministers of this church 368. Spirit of the times 370. Independence of the churches in Boston 373. Of the ministers of the first church 374.

F

Fathers apostolic, the works ascribed to them 44. Whether genuine 55.

G

Geography of the New Testament. See *Carpenter*.

Griesbach's accuracy and fidelity 89. Charges against Griesbach concerning Acts xx. 28, considered 90. His accuracy in giving his authorities for the various readings of 1 Tim. iii. 16. vindicated, 93. Remarks on 1 John, v. 7, 98. Charge against Griesbach concerning Heb. i. 8. considered 99. Value of the manual edition of his Greek Testament 100.

H

Harmony of the Gospels. See *Carpenter*.

Herculanean manuscripts 218.

Hotace, Lib. 2. Ep. 2. translated 129.

Horsley. See *Controversy*.

I

Jerusalem described 425.

Ignatius' epistles 50.

Intelligence 203. Foreign literary 216, 445.

K

Kollock's sermons reviewed. His imitation of French preachers. His distinction between the converted and unconverted 135. Characteristics of these sermons 138. Remarks on the manner in which future punishments are represented 138, and the character of God 140. General objects of the writer, and character of his sermons 145.

L

Liberal Christianity defended. Differences between the liberal and orthodox Christians 1. Charges against liberal Christians examined 2. Causes

of the errors connected with Christianity 17. Character of the Christian fathers, as interpreters of the scriptures 20. The reformers could not immediately free themselves from all errors 22. Gradual improvement since the reformation noticed 24.

Life of Semler See *Semler*.

Louisiana. See *Pike*.

M

Marsh's Lectures, notice and recommendation of, 216.

Medical degrees of Harvard College 210.

Mexico. See *Pike*.

Moore's translation of Anacreon criticised 102. Character of Anacreon 104. Difficulty of translating his poems. Moore's mistakes as to the text 105. Faults of his translation 106. His grossness and indelicacy 113.

N

New Spain. See *Pike*.

Norton. See *Emerson*.

O

Oliver. See *Comets*.

Orphan house at Halle 61.

P

Pike Maj. Z. M. his account of expeditions to the sources of the Mississippi reviewed 374. Account of the expedition up the Mississippi 375. Facts and anecdotes relating to the Indians. *passim*. Lead mines 376. Buffalo hunting 382. Account of the North West company 384, 387. Dogs used for draught 387. Great numbers of pigeons 391. Expedition into Louisiana 397, 400. Salt streams and abundance of salt 397. Prairie dog described 398. Great hardships endured by Lt. Pike and his company 401. They are seized and carried into New Spain 402. Its political divisions 403. Government. Inquisition 404. Revenue and military 405. Great estates of individuals 407. Remains of the Mexicans. Minerals, animals, &c. 409. Lt. Pike's return 410.

Poetry 129, 341.

Poems. See *Sotheby*. *Southey*.

Polyglot. See *Account* of books.

Prize questions at Harvard College 212.

Publications new 216, 224, 455, 464.

Q

Question important examined 78. A proposition cannot be understood until the words which contain it are 74. Various opinions as to the meaning of the phrase "Son of God." 76. Examination of the proposition, "There are three distinct persons in one God" 78. Divers opinions of Trinitarians 79. Reflections on the existing differences in religious opinion 83. Remarks on mysteries 87.

Questions. See *Prize*.

R

Radcliffe Mrs. extracts from her tour through Germany 120.

S

Samaritan described 428.

Sanskrit sacred writings in this language, and translations from it 457.

Schleusner's Lexicon 213. Its great value 297. Translation of the article *ΠΙΝΕΥΜΑ* from this Lexicon 397. References to works explanatory of this word 323. Index of texts explained in this article 324.

Self-Control, a novel, reviewed. Observations on novels and novel writers 191. Analysis of the story 193. Character of the incidents 199. Remarks on the characters introduced 200.

Semler's life 58. Remarks on his writings 59. His education 60. Patronised by Baumgarten 62. His zeal in literary projects. His first engagements 63. Baumgarten's mode of instruction 65. Semler appointed Professor at Halle 66. His increasing reputation 68. His mode of study 69. List of his paraphrases 71. Change in his mode of commenting 278. His critical labors and knowledge 283. His hypothesis of two Christian schools 290.

Sherman's book on the trinity noticed 352.

"*Son of God*," meaning of this phrase 76, 360.

Sotheby's Constance de Castile reviewed. His general character as a poet 410. Notices of his various works 411. Remarks on his choice of the subject, and analysis of the story 413. Account of the death of Pedro the cruel 418. Character of the poem, and of Mr. Sotheby's poetry in general 422.

Southey's character as a poet. Critique upon. Reasons why Mr. Southey has not arrived at his full reputation 433. Opinions on his works. *Thalaba* 446. *Madoc* 447. *Joan of Arc* 448. His excellences and defects as a poet particularly exemplified in the *Curse of Kehama* 448.

T

Trinity doctrine of. Various remarks upon. See *Controversy*, *Important Question*, *Worcester*, &c.

W

Weights and measures, French; principle of them anticipated by Burton 125.

Winthrop professor. See *Comets*.

Worcester Noah and Thomas. Their pamphlets on the trinitarian question reviewed. Metaphysical nature of Christ not explained in scripture 346. Origin of the doctrine of the Trinity 347. Why not rejected by the reformers 348. Remarks on Sharpe's and Middleton's rules 351. Noah Worcester's *Bible News*, analysis and account of 353. View of his arguments against the doctrine of the Trinity. Remarks on the argument from plural nouns 354. His hypothesis of the metaphysical nature of Christ 359. Meaning of the phrase "*Son of God*" 360.

Works announced 222, 228, 462, 470.

—



This book should be returned to
the Library on or before the last date

THE BORROWER WILL BE CHARGED
AN OVERDUE FEE IF THIS BOOK IS
NOT RETURNED TO THE LIBRARY ON
OR BEFORE THE LAST DATE STAMPED
BELOW. NON-RECEIPT OF OVERDUE
NOTICES DOES NOT EXEMPT THE
BORROWER FROM OVERDUE FEES.



